

the book much more valuable. One might wish they were even more precise. For at least the birthplace index, this detail could be very precise without altering the format of the index.

The fourth and last index — the “Nominal Index” (pp. 1067-1129) — has at least two significant differences from the previous three indexes: it is not new (all volumes have had one) and it includes not only the people whose biographies appear in the volume, but also everybody mentioned in all those biographies. Not surprisingly, it is the longest of the four indexes. Since it is the oldest of the indexes, it is the most stable in format. As in the texts, an asterisk appears with the names of those whose life is, or probably will be, in another volume. Unlike the text, the asterisks here are accompanied by the birth and death dates of the individuals — thereby revealing in which volume he or she appears. The editors would do us all a favour by adding these dates, or even better the volume number, to the asterisked names in the text of the last three volumes. Another oddity in both this index and the text is the usage of women’s names. They appear under their birth names, which are not necessarily the names by which they are known to history. Thus, we are told in the introduction that Anna Jameson is in the volume but she appears as Anna Murphy. She and her book are even referred to in the notes on page 832 as “Murphy, *Winter studies and summer rambles*.” In contrast, men who changed their names for social reasons, as did Peter McGill and John Halkett, are listed not under their birth names but under their better known adopted names. The result is to make women more difficult to find.

After all these limitations are considered, delight with the volume and excitement with the series remain. The quality of research, writing, and editing has been maintained and enhanced over the decades. That a single historical project launched in 1959, and conceived a decade earlier, could continue into the 1980s and 1990s to be so well done within the original plan is an indication not merely of the developed state of history in Canada, but of the developed nature of Canadian society. This achievement is even more remarkable when one considers the extraordinary changes in historical writing in Canada since the 1950s.

**Brian Murphy**  
Manuscript Division  
Public Archives of Canada

**The Prosperous Years: The Economic History of Ontario, 1939-75.** K.J. REA. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985. xiv, 287 p. ISBN 0-8020-2576-5 cl. 0-8020-6592-9 pa. \$27.50 cl. \$12.50 pa.

Between 1939 and 1975, real per capita personal income in Ontario tripled; provincial government spending quadrupled to just over one-sixth of the Gross Provincial Product in the 1972-73 fiscal year. *The Prosperous Years* — one of three volumes covering Ontario economic history from the late 1700s planned for the Ontario Historical Studies Series — is a hybrid, in part a descriptive survey of Ontario’s remarkable recent economic development, but primarily an ambitious account of the growth of provincial government activities in the economy. The book is *not* an attempt to “explain” Ontario’s economic experience. Not only does Rea believe that the use of modern macro-economic theory to analyze recent events poses “methodological conundrums” in that these economic theories were products of the period and “probably influenced the real-world events

taking place during it," but also that Canadian economic analysis lacks a model capable of handling a "subnational political-economic entity." Rea finds macro-economic analysis difficult enough at the "national level" where the many "complexities of international trade" and of "factor movements" across Canada's border muddy the waters. He finds it even more contentious at the provincial level, especially given the infancy of "provincial 'national income' accounting." It would seem that a truly analytical economic history of Ontario from 1939 to 1975 was an impossible task. To his considerable credit, Rea also rejects often ideologically-inspired attempts to apply staples theory systematically to modern Ontario. These, he says, are misguided, in light of the province's pronounced "international integration" and highly developed manufacturing sector.

An author perhaps in search of a theme, Rea defends his emphasis on state economic activities not because the private sector was not quite possibly of overwhelming practical importance or even, ironically, because government greatly affected the course of economic change; he does so because of the widely-held belief that emerged during the period that interventionist policies could exert major transforming powers. Rea's main contention is that, despite escalating state involvement in virtually every sphere of economic activity and a widespread belief in Keynesian theory and interventionist strategies, these strategies were failures. Policy implementation was not the problem; it lay instead in an initial failure to establish firmly *which* policy goals should be pursued. Ontario governments were far more pragmatic than ideological, but certainly not beyond the influence of contemporary political fashions. No comprehensive economic design materialized. Enthusiasms developed within successive Ontario administrations for policy initiatives as diverse as educational expansion, conservation, industrial promotion, urban transport, regional development, contra-cyclical budgeting, measures to attack poverty, and "neo-conservative" fiscal austerity; there was little apparent concern for consistency. Such eclecticism leaves a rich legacy for the historian and archivist. Nevertheless, not only is it impossible to determine, Rea concludes, that the overall final result of government policies was either good or bad, but also whether their net influence was "even consequential."

A consistent attempt to be comprehensive graces Rea's study, and — though buried occasionally in bloodless prose — the story is often dramatic. Evidently "muddling through," Ontario society passed through fundamental transformations in the thirty-five years after the outbreak of World War II. Following the failure of half-hearted attempts in the late years of the war to initiate co-ordinated economic planning, the Conservative governments of George Drew and Leslie Frost in the late forties and early fifties turned to an emphasis on building the "supply [as contrasted to demand] side" of Ontario's economic system through massive expenditures on public facilities: highways, hydro-electricity, and municipal services. Then, after 1958, came a movement away from the predominating concentration on establishing a favourable climate for business development. The emphasis turned from things to services: health, education, and welfare. In some respects factors remained static; distributions of income in society remained remarkably unchanged in 1975, decades after the Depression. Yet the Ontario Housing Corporation had emerged to become the second largest social housing agency in North America. Single-family detached dwellings, which accounted for 65 per cent of new housing starts in the 1950s, now accounted for only 40 per cent. By 1975 service industries and institutions, both public and private, employed close to 65 per cent of the labour force. Here, also, nearly all the growth in new jobs had been created. A gradual "bureaucratization of economic processes" had emerged through regulation and taxation.

Some contentions are questionable. Many Canadians would be surprised to learn not only that the post-1939 economic history of Ontario “closely paralleled that of the economy as a whole,” but also that “most developments in Ontario” could well be deduced intellectually from a “general economic history of Canada” with but “few modifications.” One wonders where East Coast and Prairies experiences stand in this equation. Moreover, Rea has the New Democratic Party already born and battling provincial gas transmission policies in 1957. One might also quibble occasionally over emphases and omissions. An abbreviated discussion of the tourist industry neglects significant government attempts, for example, to woo tourist revenues through the promotion of historical establishments and the overall change in marketing strategy that saw Toronto shed its traditionally drab image for that of a sophisticated urban metropolis. On a more serious level, a familiar claim made prominently in a chapter introduction that government policies in transportation and communications helped “reinforce the dominance of central Canada in the economic and cultural life of the country” is promptly called into question by such observations as that federally-imposed Seaway tolls helped kill Ontario dreams to establish major ocean ports at Toronto and elsewhere in the province. In some ways coastal ports did better. Throughout the book, Rea’s fascination with provincial policies precludes systematic analysis of Ottawa’s impact on the province.

Clearly, the author faced hard choices. While a sector by sector analysis of the provincial economy permits, for instance, consolidated surveys of forestry and finance, the rigid thematic organization does little to facilitate an overall understanding of the larger whole developing through time. Especially regrettable is the absence of an integrated account of Northern Ontario’s economy. Moreover, for a book centred so heavily on the politics of state intervention, Rea’s sense of the political process is too often impressionistic and fragmentary. Rea identifies far too infrequently, with any clarity, the leaders, pressure groups, and professional bodies advocating changed government policies. The author’s indecision, perhaps in some instances understandable, also on occasion blunts analysis. Extended summaries of competing opinion pass repeatedly without critical comment. Repeatedly, as well, Rea turns to reports of committees and commissions for canned critiques of contemporary issues without fitting these inquiries securely within the larger train of events — often admitting the insignificance of various of the investigative bodies while, ironically, at the same time tacitly inflating their importance.

It would nonetheless be singularly unfair to lay all such failings at the author’s feet. With the study of post-war Ontario’s political culture still in its infancy and few scholarly secondary sources available, Rea faced a daunting task. Nothing could be further from the truth than Ian Drummond’s prefatory comment that “little archival documentation” exists for the post-1940 period. Records management operations and the increased government responsibilities of recent years alone have conspired to increase the Archives of Ontario’s intake of economic and policy-related records at a formidable rate — in fact, somewhat beyond the institution’s current capacity to cull, arrange, and describe. Combined government records holdings of 27,000 cubic feet in 1975 have now risen to roughly 97,000 cubic feet. It need hardly be said that one researcher and his assistants could not conceivably have covered the ground thoroughly, even at the upper policy levels. In light of the difficulties, Rea has done a yeoman’s job. He has uncovered a wealth of valuable detail and observations, most of them solidly based. The rich character of the historical change described suggests an important moral. As the historical distance widens between the present and the post-war past and more historians follow Rea into a

study of modern society in Canada, it will become increasingly incumbent upon archivists to develop effective means for tackling their mountain of paper. This may, indeed, require radical measures.

**Donald Macleod**  
Archives of Ontario

**Calgary Builds. The Emergence of an Urban Landscape, 1905-1914.** BRYAN P. MELNYK. Edmonton: Alberta Culture with the Canadian Plains Research Center, 1985. 213 p. illus. ISBN 0889770387 \$15.00.

Bryan P. Melnyk's *Calgary Builds. The Emergence of an Urban Landscape, 1905-1914*, is an expository view of Calgary's first major attempt to develop as an urban centre. The work, which was Melnyk's Master's thesis from the University of Calgary, concentrates on the building boom in Calgary from 1905 to 1914 when the city experienced rapid growth. This period of growth witnessed a change in architectural style due to a social need for a more modern and progressive image, and the boom economy itself. There is a present-day Canadian myth that Calgary did not enter the twentieth century until the oil expansion period following the 1973 Yom Kippur War. The fallacy of this myth is strengthened by this work. The first two decades of this century are shown as the period when Calgary evolved from a prairie ranching centre to a sophisticated distribution centre.

Melnyk adeptly expresses the liberal optimism of the time. Economic and social gains were being made by individuals who had left established and rural communities in eastern Canada, the United States, and Europe. The population of Calgary expanded sixfold and those citizens who had left older and more firmly established centres desired creation of the same and even more enhanced social institutions. These services were provided by the structures which were being constructed and these structures became the symbols of the progressive growth of the period.

Many hold the belief that cities in western Canada have become sprawling communities because they were adapted to the expansive physical environment of the surrounding prairie. However, the author concludes that the reason for this was more complex. Western Canadian cities were developing at a time when Europeans and eastern North Americans were crying out against the tenements and more confined physical restraints of the Victorian urban community. Calgarians' response to this outcry is reflected through their residential, public, and commercial development. The Calgary citizenry desired their own private homes with surrounding gardens, substantial and impressive public buildings, and large practical commercial buildings. This was because they had an inherent belief that such an environment would nurture a community of individuals who would be thrifty, conservative in thought, and at the same time individualistic. Calgarians were thus expressing the ideals of the majority of their progenitors: the British.

Bryan Melnyk has used a wide selection of primary and secondary sources. His use of municipal sources is brief, but this criticism should be directed at municipal archives as well as at Melnyk, for those archivists in municipal repositories must strive for better preservation and description of their records. He has attempted to compensate for this gap by conducting his research among many published sources. However, he has not made