the party bound together by a common set of beliefs about the party's purpose, principles, and basic strategy to be pursued. The *luttes* or battles followed a well-established protocol, a set of normative rules intended to define the limits of acceptable behaviour by *tendances* or dissident groups. Exceeding those limits quickly resulted in strict disciplinary action by the leadership. Thus, disagreement was permitted, but also well contained within the structure of internal party politics. In 1938 the protest came from the *tendances*, and the leadership knew how to deal with this form of opposition. In 1946 the protest movement was much more heterogeneous, factional in nature, drawing together a diverse group which rallied behind an individual, in this case Guy Mollet, whose promise and strategy was to overthrow the established party leadership and seize power for himself and his faction. From that position of power, the various grievances could be resolved. The established leadership was unused to this type of politics and unable to combat it, for the dissidents refused to follow the traditional protocol of protest. In the end, Mollet succeeded in ousting the established leadership.

It is unclear what purpose the models serve. The story could be told and the points made as effectively without reference to them. In fact, there is not much integration, so that the narrative largely stands alone. Only in the conclusion are the models discussed in any detail, and even here they are not used to explain the narrative so much as the narrative is used as data to demonstrate the models. This may very well be less disturbing for a political scientist than for a historian. In the end, however, this problem does not undermine the work, for Graham has done a masterful job of leading the reader through the labyrinth that was SFIO politics between 1937 and 1950, explaining the changes in the nature of the party's structure and leadership and their consequences.

Lynne Taylor
University of Waterloo

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. Pp. v, 280.

This study has not topped the non-fiction bestseller lists, nor will it. In *That Noble Dream* (Cambridge, 1988), Peter Novick notes of *Time on the Cross* that those looking for the foundations for Fogel's and Engermann's ''conclusion that slaves were only moderately exploited'' were referred to a long and relatively incomprehensible equation (p. 588). Gordon Darroch's and Lee Soltow's book is based on equations equally daunting. Theirs is a work that requires considerable expertise in cliometrics. When the two invite the reader to ''consider'' a calculation, they do so with the easy and disarming confidence that that reader, fully armed with an intimate knowledge of the intricacies of multiple regression analysis and the like, can do so readily and pleasurably. Shall I confess that in my case their confidence is misplaced? Or relay my suspicion and hope that some other readers will share

my deficiencies? Unfortunately, such readers will find *Property and Inequality* a tough read, and they will be obliged to take much of the statistical foundation of the work on faith. Unable to discern if the authors have handled or mishandled their multiple R squares, I found, early on, my confidence in my ability to follow their logic shaken. Their work is based on a study of 5,699 adults aged 20 and over drawn from all areas of the province. These ''represented about 1.4 per cent of the province's population'' (p. 14). Even I could quickly see that those 5,699 did not *constitute* 1.4 per cent of Ontario's 1,620,851 people. How, then, did the authors arrive at their figure? Some pages after the discussion of its selection, the reader finds that the sample includes 303 female and 3,886 male household heads. There must have been 16,993 other members in the households of the 4,189 household heads, or 4.01 per head, for the sample to ''represent'' 1.4 per cent of the provincial population. The authors' ready confidence that none of this requires explanation, flattering though I found it, made me wary of their cheery invitations to ''consider'' their various calculations. What mental gymnastics might these require?

On the other hand, the authors explain the mechanics of how they selected their sample very carefully indeed. Placing each roll of microfilm on the same reader, turning the crank five revolutions and alternating the direction they turned every other reel helped assure them that their sample was both truly random and regionally representative. Alas, the very first reel of microfilm I used to test this procedure — one for Northumberland County — was illegible, at least to my eyes. Did the authors or their research assistants not encounter this problem? If so, how did they solve it?

Lest I give the wrong impression, let me say that I do have confidence in the authors' work. I am prepared to rely on their authority in areas where I lack expertise, to let them lead where I cannot always follow. The two are distinguished scholars, with economist Soltow authoring a series of monographs on wealth-holding in the United States, as well as one on Norway, and with sociologist Darroch publishing a range of articles on property and ethnicity in Ontario. I am also impressed by their sample. The National Health and Social Life Survey published in the United States in 1994 used just 3,432 people to chart the sexual habits and preferences of men and women between the ages of 18 and 59. Darroch's and Soltow's study, examining an arguably less complex topic for a much smaller population, does so from a considerably wider base.

Property and Inequality is a very important book. It may, to borrow a phrase, help save us from ''the fallacy of the lonely fact''. Possession of land was much prized in North America. In Ontario, as Allan Smith has argued, ownership was an important signifier of status and economic well-being. Unlike the 1851–1852 and 1861 censuses with which I am familiar, the 1871 census asked questions about the ownership, rather than just the occupation, of lands and buildings. Darroch and Soltow are able to establish rates of ownership across a range of variables: age, occupation, sex, ethnicity, religious affiliation, location, literacy. Their major finding is that ownership of real property rested on a wide base, as it did in the contemporary United States, but that the overall shape of ownership was pyramidical.

In 1871 over half of the males working in Ontario described themselves as farmers. As Marvin McInnis's work on size of farms in 1861 would suggest, a considerable degree of equality existed among them on the score of real property. Though 38 per cent of rural men had no land and 12 per cent of farmers were tenants (the census also yields data on tenancy), almost all farmer household heads owned land. Here the life cycle was important, with many farmers' sons, who might reasonably expect to become landowners, being among the rural landless. On balance, the ''processes of land acquisition were still open and encouraging'' (p. 40). Farmers had, on average, 75.8 acres, with the younger generally owning less than the older. One-fifth of the farmers owned almost three-fifths of the land. The pattern of inequality within the farm community corresponded to that in the northern United States of the same period.

Corroborating Donald Akenson's finding for Leeds and Lansdowne townships that the foreign-born were not disadvantaged in property ownership is the fact that 74 per cent of the immigrants, who were on average older than the native-born, were landowners, while just 52.5 per cent of the latter were. Adjustments for age bring the two populations in line with each other. In matters of land immigrants were privileged when compared to those in the United States. Corroborating Akenson further is the authors' conclusion that the Irish were more likely to be landowners than either the English or the Welsh.

Various inequalities existed. While 12 per cent of farmers were tenants, 29 per cent of all men were. Only 5 per cent of labourers owned land. One-third of female heads of households owned land, but approximately half of their male counterparts did; 47.3 per cent of all adult males owned homes, with non-owners concentrated among the young. Almost two-thirds of farmers owned homes while just under one-third of non-farmers did. Labourers and Catholics lived in shanties in disproportionate numbers. Fewer than one-tenth of the men owned 39.4 per cent of the housing. The ''virtually propertyless'' counted 39 per cent of all adult men among their ranks. Among male household heads the figure dropped to about 14 per cent, shooting up to twice that for female household heads. In the towns 36.4 per cent of household heads were propertyless, and in the five leading cities this figure was 59 per cent. The illiterates did not own as many houses per capita or hold acreages as large as the literate.

Property and Inequality, in short, is a gold mine of statistics. Clearly these will be put to different uses by different scholars. I find the conclusions of the authors agreeable: ''the proportions of adult men in Ontario in 1871 owning land and homes were little short of spectacular by the international standards'' of the time (p. 188). In fact, ''a person could obtain a workable plot of land with rare ease'' (p. 194). ''By European standards, mid-Victorian Ontario would still have appeared, as it had earlier, as a land of nearly unmatched opportunity'' (p. 198). These judgements appear sound, especially if one considers that property ownership was likely to have been underreported in the census by those fearing that the authorities would use the data collected in determining taxes.

I began by carping. I shall finish similarly. For some years now the University of Toronto Press has published books without bibliographies. This is another. It is

maddening to have to plough through pages and pages of notes to find a reference. Why annoy your readers? Publish a bibliography.

Colin Read
Huron College
University of Western Ontario

R. D. Gidney and W. P. J. Millar — *Inventing Secondary Education: The Rise of the High School in Nineteenth Century Ontario*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990. Pp. x, 411.

As someone who profited from the visit of Bob Gidney, Winn Millar, and Catherine Gidney to Monash University in 1986 (p. xi), I enjoyed reading this closely textured account of secondary education in Ontario. In challenging ''the conviction that nineteenth-century school systems were primarily fashioned at the centre by a handful of influential policy makers and that the immediate clientele of the schools had relatively little to say in the matter'', the authors ''focus on the interaction between centre and locality, and ... stress the role played in policy making by many actors'', demonstrating that ''Ryerson's attempt to reform the grammar schools succeeded only where his policies ... did not conflict with the interests and wishes of local people'' (p. 315).

The authors ''chart the transition from traditional to modern institutions ... in Ontario between the 1840s and the 188Os'' (p. 7), warning that, in writing about education before the 1860s, the language and structures of the present provide misleading anachronisms. They examine the creation of the modern secondary school, also accounting for ''some at least of the origins of the tripartite organization so characteristic of modern education systems'' (p. 7). The argument is carefully developed and documented for Ontario and, both in general similarities and specific differences, it is significant for those studying similar developments elsewhere.

They ask:

> How does one explain the organization of education in early Upper Canada other than by ''the conventional elementary-secondary dichotomy''?
> Why was ''a linked, sequential, second stage of a tripartite system'' introduced?
> Why were Upper Canadian secondary schools in the public sector?
> Why did they become coeducational and comprehensive?

They examine the senior classes of the common schools and the Upper Canadian grammar schools which became the late-nineteenth-century public secondary schools of the respectable middle classes, ''people who could afford the opportunity costs and other expenses of keeping their children in school for a few years longer than the majority of Upper Canadians'' (p. 9). The work is enriched by data drawn from their intensive study of five southwestern Ontario grammar schools in Brantford, Sarnia, Simcoe, Stratford, and Strathroy.