Regulating the Old Orders: The Ontario Milk Marketing Board and Old Order Mennonites and Amish

Jodey Nurse, *University of Waterloo*

Introduction

By the late 1960s, the "simple life" of Ontario's Old Order Mennonite and Amish communities was in peril according to the national press. A 1967 *Globe and Mail* article claimed that the freedom that had attracted Old Orders to Ontario more than "165 years ago ha[d] become so laced with Governmental regulations that their descendants [were] beginning to wonder if they should move on."[1] The article cited various grievances suffered by some Old Order groups because of increased government regulation, including their opposition to registering with the Ontario Milk Marketing Board (OMMB), which they were required to do in order to sell milk. One in a series of new regulatory bodies that affected Mennonite and Amish farmers in Ontario in the late 1960s and following decades, the OMMB required all dairy farmers to adopt new production regulations, including new technology, such as refrigerated bulk milk tanks, and more restrictive sales practices.

While some Old Order communities were against these changes, it is important to note that they did not represent all Old Order Anabaptists on this issue. Newspaper accounts often confuse Old

Order Mennonites and Amish or make no distinction between those Old Order Mennonites whose *Ordnung* accepted the use of electricity and those which did not. These newspaper reports can give the false impression that all Old Orders opposed these changes, however, this was not the case. Various Old Order communities existed, each with differing Ordnungen. For example, Old Order Amish and the David Martin Old Order Mennonites in Ontario rejected the use of electricity, but many Old Order Mennonites in Ontario did not oppose the use of electricity and new technologies, but rather accepted the OMMBs regulations, remained in dairy farming, and continue to produce milk in Ontario today. Still, for those who did oppose these changes, the OMMB represented another modernizing force against which they struggled to maintain traditional ways of life even in the most "sacred vocation"[2]: farming.

For most dairy farmers in the province, the creation of the OMMB represented a new era of stability in the industry. The OMMB was created in 1965 to introduce fairer farm pricing and production discipline through milk quotas because of chronic overproduction in the industry, which had resulted in devastatingly low milk prices and distress in the dairy community.[3] All dairy farmers had suffered under these conditions. The problem for some Old Order Mennonite and Amish farmers was not controlled production necessarily, but that in addition to stabilizing milk prices through quotas, the OMMB was also pursuing policies that encouraged the most marginal or small-scale operators to modernize or leave the industry. This modernization included new technologies such as bulk milk systems that required electric power to operate. Certainly more dairy farms survived during this period because of OMMB policies than would have otherwise, and trends towards modernization were being pursued elsewhere as well, but the board did not hide the fact that they believed these changes were necessary for a viable dairy sector in the future. While their goal was to see the family farm survive, they wanted farmers to make capital investments that they argued would lead to greater efficiencies and more standardization in the industry. With this goal in mind, the OMMB regulated the mandatory conversion from milk can shipping to bulk shipping in 1977 to ensure more hygienic standards and a rationalization of the transportation of milk, a measure that had serious implications for the province's Old Order dairy farmers who opposed the use of electricity. At the heart of this disagreement were questions about how much regulation was necessary to ensure safe dairy products, what measures were needed for greater economy in the industry, and how much control

should the government and the OMMB have over how farmers produced their milk.

This article examines these questions by highlighting the coverage of this high-profile disagreement among some Old Order groups and the OMMB in the popular press and explores the period's multiple perspectives on modernization and agricultural industrialization. The complex nature of rural society during this period is revealed, as well as the diversity of opinions and practices held by farmers and farm advocates. And while most farmers accepted the changes as necessary and inevitable, the minority who did not found support among city folk who, although fully ensconced in modern ways, expressed criticism for the costs of modern technologies and high energy consumption. Furthermore, unlike other small-scale farmers who refused the new electrically refrigerated bulk milk tanks because of cost, Old Orders refused the technology because of religious conviction. In what historian T. D. Regehr labels as a "basically friendly" Canadian society during and after World War Two that pursued more accommodative, rather than assimilative practices in regard to Mennonite communities and their religious beliefs,[4] this episode demonstrates support for those beliefs, but ultimately not enough to reverse the OMMBs decision regarding the use of milk cans and bulk tank systems. Agricultural industrialization continued to accelerate after 1970, and the demands placed on farmers to accept changes to industry standards intensified. Those who were willing or able to accept these changes remained, while those who did not left the business or the province.

The Postwar Activist Government

New dairy regulations were not the only concern some Old Orders in Ontario had during the postwar era. Old Order Mennonites and Amish rejected many of the new state policies being pursued at the time, including medicare, old age pensions, and social assistance.[5] Anabaptists believed in caring for the material needs of their people, and for the Old Orders this duty was inseparable from their faith. As the state became more active in providing welfare for its citizens, Old Orders were among those people who argued that "they could not, without violating their faith, transfer the task of caring for the material needs of their people to the government."[6] Old Orders believed that the various welfare-state measures pursued in the years following the Second World War would "weaken the bonds of their communities and represent a

marked departure from the way of life they believed to be right for them."[7] While the Old Orders were exempted from participating in the Canadian Pension Program (CPP), such exemptions from mandatory government programs were not always possible. The liberal values pursued during this period could be in opposition to their communal way of life, and if Old Orders were unwilling to compromise and adjust to the new demands placed upon them and policy makers were inflexible, lives were forced to change.[8]

The change experienced in Ontario in the 1960s, like elsewhere in Canada, was significant. The extensive application of new technologies in manufacturing and other industrial production, transportation, communications, and agricultural production were creating a new level of modernization previously unknown. Of course, the degrees of modernization varied across Canada, and subcultures such as Old Order Mennonites and Amish were more closely bound to traditional practices than most other groups. In order to maintain these practices, Old Order communities constructed elements of resistance through dress, transportation, religious rituals, language, and the rejection of certain technologies and policies seen as antithetical to their way of life.[9] No Old Order group completely rejected innovation, but the tools they adopted had to fortify their way of life, rather than challenge it. When these communities were mandated to accept new government regulations that they believed compromised their "simple" way of living, they often attempted to negotiate those changes.[10] These outside forces, however, were not always negotiable. For instance, in 1966, the extension of Ontario's Workmen's Compensation Act to all farmers was opposed by some Old Order Mennonites and Amish who argued that they did not pay salaries and had no intention of participating in the program's benefits.[11] This particular law was cited as a reason for why some Amish families decided to uproot and move to Belize.[12] Migration was one way some Old Orders attempted to maintain their traditional way of life when compromise was rejected.

Some people, however, held an optimistic view of Old Orders' place in Ontario society in the early 1970s. Exemption from the CPP and Canada's "emphasis on maintaining the cultural distinctiveness of its various people" were said to "provide hope" to Old Order groups.[13] Furthermore, similar to the United States, the Amish and Mennonites were typically respected for their interdependent practices and staunch belief that they must take care of their own.[14] Indeed, the generally positive views that the public held about Old Order Amish and Mennonites were a significant reason why those who disagreed with the proposed bulk milk-

cooling tanks received such public support for their opposition in 1977.

Modernizing the Dairy Farm

Farming, similar to other areas of life, was experiencing a turbulent period of transformation in the 1960s and 70s. Increased modernization, capitalization, commercialization, and specialization were all finding form in Ontario's agricultural industries, and rural populations were left trying to decide whether to accept, resist, or negotiate these new modernizing forces. In the 1950s and 1960s, it was generally the farmers who embraced modern farming practices who were celebrated, especially in the agricultural press. For example, in 1968, the owner of Golden Dell Farm, Mr. Harold Crawford, obtained a certificate from the Ontario Hydro Chairman, George Gathercole, during a special ceremony celebrating his "well-electrified farm." The event was attended by press, radio and television representatives, and government and electrical industry officials, as well as Crawford's family. Gathercole commended Crawford for his progressive outlook, noting that he and his young family represented the successful family farmers who continued "to be the backbone of Canadian agriculture today."[15] The farm's use of mechanical equipment, a portable pipeline system, and other electrically-powered tools such as the gutter cleaner system and electric cattle trainers used to encourage cleanliness and ease of manure handling, were noted, but special attention was given to the new 400-gallon bulk tank in a specially-built milk house.[16]

The first voluntary installations of electrically-refrigerated bulk milk tanks began in Ontario in 1953 and most farms converted rapidly to their use.[17] The *Ontario Milk Producer*, the OMMB's official producer magazine, helped promote new technological and biological innovations, as well as conveying important legislative and regulatory changes in the industry and other methods for improved husbandry and economy. In a June 1963 article, Dr. F. H. Theakston, a professor in the School of Agricultural Engineering at the University of Guelph, wrote on the topic on bulk tank storage and noted that the tanks had revolutionized the handling of milk. He conceded that the change was not always easy since the necessity of constructing a new milk house and purchasing a tank could be expensive, but he believed all "Fluid milk producers will be compelled to move to a bulk milk system," citing "there is rarely an instance that bulk methods have not proved to be better than

the "old way" and the owner has new pride in operating an up-to-date program. Sanitary, higher quality milk should result."[18] In addition to the labour saving quality of milk tanks, promoters regularly focused on a tank's ability to achieve more sanitary conditions by reducing sources of contamination and moving milk from the cow to the cooler in the shortest possible time.[19] Bulk tank distributors, of course, also highlighted the benefits of their "NEW, MODERN, COMPLETELY-AUTOMATED" milk tanks, including how they allowed for "Finer-Flavored, Higher-Quality Milk."[20] A variety of companies had emerged to offer producers a wide wage of bulk tank designs and sizes by the late 1960s, and dealers of used bulk coolers were also servicing producers.[21]

From early on the bulk tank system was lauded for making "definite improvements in the bacteriological quality of milk."[22] Experts championed the system, but they did warn against the illusion that the device solved all milk quality problems. Other diligent practices were needed to eliminate flavor defects, which were said to be caused by faulty feeding practices, mastitis, chemical contamination, or improper agitation.[23] Despite the issues that remained, however, the clear consensus among dairy experts and scientists was that the new system improved milk quality. Another benefit for the industry was that the use of bulk tanks helped facilitate the rationalization of milk transportation routes among fluid (also referred to as Class A or Group 1) milk shippers.[24] Changes in the transportation system in Ontario were among the most difficult tasks the OMMB faced during this period, but the board was committed to the process, which they argued benefitted most producers and lowered the cost of production.[25]

While plans were made in the 1960s to have all fluid milk producers use bulk tanks for milk transportation and quality control purposes, it was not until the 1970s that mandatory regulations were enacted. All producers of fluid and industrial milk (cream was excluded) were required to make a can-to-bulk conversion by October 31, 1977. Most Ontario dairy farmers had already adopted the use of bulk tanks by this time; less than six percent of milk marketed in the province in 1976 was shipped in cans.[26] Many celebrated these modernizing efforts, but among those who opposed the regulations were some Old Order Mennonites and Amish. They reportedly contested the adoption of electrically-refrigerated bulk milk tanks and other new technologies because it required "giv[ing] up their simple system of farming."[27]

Old Orders are said to have a "spiritual connection to the soil," developed through the belief that the "tilling of soil [is] a divine duty God directed in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:21)," and the

conviction that "the small family farm is the best place to raise children in faith."[28] Furthermore, their commitment to the small family farm meant that they had a comparatively low capital investment because of the generally smaller acreages and the use of limited machinery.[29] Farming was considered the occupation with the greatest freedom of choice in day-to-day living, and Mennonite and Amish farmers valued having fewer restrictions in managing their operations and more diversity in the modes of production pursued.[30] The mandatory conversion to bulk shipping, however, would require the use of electricity to power the refrigerated coolers, which was against the Ordnung of some Old Order Mennonites and Amish governing farm technology.[31]

By the summer of 1977, these Old Orders were appealing to the OMMB to allow them to find dairy processing facilities that would accept their milk in cans,[32] however, the board was reluctant to make any such concession. They argued that part of their mandate was to ensure a safe, quality milk supply, and they believed that bulk tank refrigeration was necessary to achieve a more efficient, higher quality product because milk could be cooled more quickly, stored longer, and the bacteria count held down.[33] Furthermore, it was reported that "Producers who are still shipping in cans are paying dearly for it. The price differential between bulk and can shipments has risen steadily over recent years, and now stands at 35 cents per hundredweight. Transporters also charge an additional 50 cents for cwt. for the extra handling."[34] For the OMMB, the conversion to bulk shipping simply made sense. The Mennonites and Amish who protested these regulations, however, argued that they were clean and diligent farmers whose milk met the same standards as other producers even when transported in cans, and that they should be given the choice to convert or not.[35]

Old Orders were not the only ones who took issue with the new regulations. The Secretary of the Milk Commission of Ontario, J. F. Jewson, wrote to "can producers" on September 12, 1974, to report that "The Milk Commission of Ontario, as well as your Marketing Board, is very much concerned about the increasing difficulties associated with the marketing of can milk. As the number of can producers declines, the costs of marketing can milk will steadily increase, widening the overall spread between the returns of can and bulk producers. Fewer plants are equipped to properly receive milk in cans."[36] Jewson encouraged can producers to take advantage of incentive programs and grants that aided producers in converting to bulk shipping, noting that while "Every effort will be made to market [canned] milk for as long as possible," that eventually, "it will be impractical and uneconomical to do so."[37] Arnold

Rupert, a farmer from Lunenburg, Ontario, wrote to Jewson in response, colourfully detailing his difficulties, including how he "could modernize & then in 3-5 years, sell out as a lot of [his] neighbours have and get about $400. for the $3000. tank & nothing for the $2000. milk house, loosing $2000. of the Government's Capital Grant money & $2500. of [his] own." Rupert went on to explain that, whichever way he chose, it would "involve can milk or no milk." He cheekily noted as well, "I draw my own milk because that gives me a chance to get away from the cow's ass for a few minutes anyway…If Your problem is getting milk hauled, I would be pleased to take on a few other farmers' hauling & quit milking myself."[38] The costs associated with the conversion to bulk shipping were unrealistic for many of the province's smallest producers or those looking to retire in the near future.

Government officials and the OMMB were committed to improving farming for producers, but they believed that there were too many inefficient producers who needed to adopt new practices or transition out of the industry. The new shipping and transportation requirements were simply another way in which the postwar industry was trying to encourage producers to be more efficient, raise their incomes, and "deliver better quality milk to market in an economical manner."[39] The *Ontario Milk Producer* highlighted the stories of farmers who had made the conversion without regret. One such story featured dairy farmer and Gananoque resident J. Ross McLean, who noted that "The bulk tank is a big labour saver… it's sure nice not to have to wash or lug cans anymore. I really should have made the change five years ago."[40] McLean's decision to convert came after he considered a variety of factors, including his son Brian's desire to continue to farm in the future. "There's no question that the advantages are all on the side of bulk milk," McLean reported. "It's certainly an easier system to work with, and the quality of milk is better." While McLean agreed the decision to convert could be a difficult one based on a farmer's labour needs and cost, but "with lower transportation charges and a higher price for bulk milk, it just makes sense that the cost of any new equipment or building will be recovered."[41] For McLean, "The long-term benefits of bulk production for the individual, as well as the entire industry, [were] pretty clear."[42]

Support for Old Order Opposition

With the deadline for the mandatory implementation of bulk milk tanks fast approaching by the summer of 1977, newspapers

started to earnestly cover the plight of dairy farmers who wished to continue to ship milk in cans. The popular press was sympathetic to the farmers who opposed the new regulation and were either having to make the switch to bulk tanks, find creameries to take their product at a lower price, or being "forced out of the business."[43] Some supporters believed that the changes were harming small farmers and rural communities. Others were concerned that the new rules infringed on individuals' rights.[44] Proponents of the measures attempted to reassure the public that the decision to terminate can shipping was the result of extensive rounds of meetings and consultations with producers and processors in the province and reflected "the recommendations and wishes of the majority of milk producers and processors" and was "made after very careful consideration of its overall effect on the industry,"[45] but not everyone was convinced.

While some aging and small-scale dairy farmers fighting against the new measures found public support, the group that received the greatest degree of public sympathy was the Old Order Mennonites and Amish who opposed the new regulations, not simply because of economics or individual choice (although economics would have been a factor; many Old Orders produced on a small scale and the new technology required a considerable investment), but because the necessary conversion required the use of technology that compromised their religious beliefs. As noted earlier, the Ordnung governing farm technology for some Old Order communities did not allow for the energy use refrigerated bulk tanks required. Similar changes were occurring in the United States, as state health boards moved to require the use of bulk storage and shipping, and Old Orders had to make difficult decisions about their future in the dairy business.[46] In Ontario, the same difficult choices about adapting to new conditions or finding ways to create distance from these modernizing forces – be that through a new occupation or geographical migration – were necessary. For example, the *Toronto Star* reported that the impending dairy regulations had already led seven Old Order Amish farmers and their families to leave Waterloo County for Pennsylvania because "Ontario's new agriculture rules [were] making their way of farming impossible." Henry Hertzler, an Amish farmer who had moved with his brother Jacob to Ontario from Pennsylvania in 1959 in the pursuit of greater opportunity,[47] was quoted saying that the new milk regulations had made them regret their choice.[48] The Hertzlers claimed that as many as 100 Amish dairy farmers across Ontario were planning to move out of the province if they did not receive an exemption from the milk marketing board's legislation.[49]

The Ontario Human Rights Commission investigated the plight of those Amish and Mennonite farmers who opposed the changes and a number of advocates tried to insist that an exemption was necessary, but their appeal to the legislation was turned down and the new regulations were set to take effect as scheduled.[50] While some Amish families chose to relocate, others remained and continued to seek an exemption, employing lawyers to fight their regulatory battle. At an Ontario Milk Commission hearing on October 18th, John Laskin, a lawyer retained by the Mennonite community to act on the farmers behalf, argued that these Old Order Mennonites and Amish farmers' very way of life was in jeopardy if they were forced to obey the OMMB regulations. Furthermore, he argued, farmers should be given the opportunity of meeting milk quality standards using their traditional modes of production.[51]

In postwar United States, the Amish's resistance to new innovations in agriculture, reliance on small farms, and emphasis on family labour is said to have temporarily shifted views of the Amish from "being desirable, frugal citizens to being backward, uneducated farmers who were resistant to change."[52] In Ontario, the OMMB and government officials were more understanding, but nevertheless they remained convinced that these new regulations were the way of the future. OMMB General Manager, Lorne Hurd, insisted that milk cans were unsafe. He argued that it was "impossible for milk that isn't cooled and is shipped in cans to meet Ontario health standards consistently." Hurd expressed sympathy, noting that the OMMB's regulations had not been intended to harm Old Order farmers, but rather "to increase the efficiency of the industry, keep milk prices down and guarantee a more sanitary product."[53] Hurd encouraged these farmers to switch from milk to cream production, which still allowed for the use of cans.[54] While the Ontario Cream Producers' Marketing Board (separate from the OMMB) and the processors of farm-separated cream were interested in "providing a market for as many of the can milk shippers as wish to switch to cream production,"[55] this was not a satisfactory solution for many Old Order farmers because most cream producers still relied on government subsidies in order to survive in cream production, a concession they frowned upon. Hurd conceded that, under the new quality control regulations and future improvements to the quality and safety of milk production, greater automation was coming, making non-automated milk production no longer possible. He suggested Amish farmers centre their farm businesses on hog farming and other forms of production that did not require the same technological investments.[56]

Defenders of the Old Orders opposing the OMMB believed that the government and the milk board were willing to proceed with their plans, despite the consequences, because they understood that "The Amish belief in a simple way of life if so strong that if the commission turns down their request, they will make no further protest, but try to find other work."[57] One lawyer employed by the Mennonite community, Ian Hunter, reported to the *Toronto Star* that the Old Orders refused to go through the courts because, as one member told him, they'd "rather suffer an injustice than create a fuss."[58]

The press overwhelmingly sympathized with the Old Orders in this dispute. Newspapers such as the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star* were already critical of the OMMB for what they saw as its intrusion into the "free market" and on individual rights. The board's inability to accommodate these Old Order Amish and Mennonite communities was used as evidence that "our government was prepared to ride roughshod" over peoples' religious and personal freedoms.[59] While the issue of the accommodation of minority groups has a long history in Canada, who has been accommodated has changed over place and time. As historian William Janzen explains, "On the one hand, there is a long history with some basic structures for the accommodation of certain groups. On the other hand, there is a 'liberal' political culture that has emphasized individualism, a certain egalitarianism, majority rule, integration, and participation, with only limited appreciation for the significance of distinct groups."[60] Janzen notes that for minority groups such as the Mennonites, Hutterites, and Doukhobors, they "found a degree of accommodation, a measure of liberty," but that these liberties were vulnerable to public pressure and dependent on the political culture and institutions awarding such liberties.[61] While the OMMB's regulations had the support of most dairy farmers and the government, some of the public was less aware of the reasons for the mandatory regulations and believed that a peaceable people were being arbitrarily compelled to change against their wishes.

Old Orders had a generally positive image in the province. Their supporters often expressed their admiration for Old Orders' "moral standing, peace-loving nature, hard-work, and productive lifestyles."[62] The rapid change that all citizens were experiencing in the postwar period and the hard economic times that had begun in the 1970s had caused many people to worry about the future of modern society. In part, people's support for the Old Orders' dilemma reflected their own anxieties about a fast-paced, modernizing world. New innovations had led to modern conven-

iences, but they also caused a more hurried and, in some ways, more isolated society.[63] The desire for simplicity reflected an anti-modern sentiment about modern lifestyles, as well as nostalgic views about the diminished work-ethic and morality of modern citizens more generally.

The public support Old Order dairy farmers received also stemmed from their rejection of modern energy usage at a time of energy crisis and growing environmental concern. As historian Ruth W. Sandwell explains, Canada adopted modern sources of energy use much later than most industrialized nations, however, Canadians nevertheless consumed more energy per capita than most other peoples in the world.[64] It came as a shock then, when in the early 1970s, oil prices tripled within a six-month period because of the Arab-Israeli war and the associated shortages.[65] Energy worries, alongside concerns about rising food and house prices, were mounting. By 1975, inflation had reached thirteen percent, eroding purchasing power.[66] Furthermore, the environmentalism that had began in the 1960s gained momentum in the 1970s as a broader segment of the population accepted the obvious impact of human activity.[67]

By 1977, Ontarians were sympathetic to these Old Order communities' desire to remove themselves from modern energy use. Joan Froud, of Willowdale, wrote, "we are told daily to cut down on the use of electricity by turning down our thermostats, making our dishwashers and washing machines work at full capacity, insulating our homes better and turning off our lights. This is exactly what the Amish have done but by 100 per cent instead of 10 per cent."[68] Another supporter, Anita Flaherty, from Oakville, wrote in support of "these hard-working, unselfish people," noting that "Since energy is the bane of our existence in the western world, why force the Amish against their religious beliefs to convert to electricity?"[69] Other letters to the editor expressed similar sentiments about the hypocrisy of a government that advocated for energy conservation, yet punished those who practiced it in its fullest form.[70] Ontarians, as indeed Canadians and other citizens of the world, realized that the transition to new energy sources and their reliance of those sources had a cost, both environmentally and economically. Certainly, most people were grateful for the modern conveniences electricity allowed, but they could still appreciate the fortitude and self-reliance these Old Orders demonstrated by their rejection of modern energy sources.

Finally, the increasingly activist government that emerged in the postwar years was also not embraced by everyone. The *Toronto Star* called on readers to voice their opposition to the board's "bu-

reaucratic tyranny" and "lust for efficiency and profits" and for "driving these decent, hard-working people out of dairying and possibly out of Ontario."[71] The increased government intervention and bureaucracy evidenced in the postwar era led critics to charge that the OMMB was simply another dictatorial state-initiated body infringing on individual freedom.[72] Canadians' demonstrated a growing willingness to challenge state initiatives during this period that were deemed "silly" or lacking "tolerance for diversity."[73] Journalist Jonathan Manthrope argued that "It is not only the milk that is getting homogenized these days… The confrontation between the Amish, representing the old and enduring values of rural life, and the milk commission, representing the drive to improve agricultural production through technology, has caught people's imagination." He further noted that, "The letters-to-the-editor columns of *The Star* show clearly that people are upset by the idea of government arbitrarily threatening a respected way of life that just happens to be different from the mainstream. So much for the multi-cultural patchwork."[74]

For Manthorpe and some others who opposed the new regulations, the OMMB's actions disregarded individual rights, showed a lack of accommodation for the province's religious minorities, and demonstrated a desire to jump "on the farming-through-high-technology bandwagon," which were believed to be harming small businesses in an effort to centralize milk production and processing. Manthorpe argued, "When one looks at the entire policy of the Ontario government in this area one is led inescapably to the view that it does not want small family farms. It wants larger farming units using efficient – and expensive – equipment."[75]

The reality, of course, was much more complicated. The provincial and federal governments in Canada had long studied the reoccurring crises in the nation's dairying industry and had decided that it was important to support dairy farm families by allowing them to earn a living wage, which they argued required varied measures. In addition to supply management, which required import control, producer pricing, and production discipline, the industry believed that processes of rationalization had to occur so that the most inefficient farmers exited the business. Studies conducted by ministries of agriculture throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s all pointed to the same findings: farms needed to grow, adopt new technologies and improved husbandry methods, and supply lines needed to be streamlined. In the case of bulk shipping regulations, the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star* were critical of the OMMB for "not want[ing] small family farms," yet previously they were all too ready to charge the board with resisting

efficient, scientific, large-scale production in an effort to support the "superfluous one-horse farmer."[76] The inconsistency of the newspapers' messaging reflected their opportunistic use of the dispute as another way in which to discredit an organization that they felt hindered the "free market" and other neoliberal values. Despite these criticisms in the press, however, the Ontario Dairy Commission ruled in the milk marketing board's favour. Although the deadline for the implementation of bulk tank systems was delayed, ultimately, Old Orders were required to "operate bulk milk tanks by gasoline-powered or diesel-powered engines" if they wished to stay in the fluid milk market.[77]

Conclusion

Although the new dairy regulations were generally accepted, even welcomed, by many Old Order Mennonites in Ontario, for those Old Order communities who rejected public electricity these rules meant that some farmers were forced to make concessions in order to remain in business, including the use of bulk milk tanks powered by diesel-powered generators.[78] Others decided to transition into cream production that still allowed for shipping in cans or left the dairy industry and focused on other modes of farming that did not require mandatory investments in new technologies. And some Old Order Amish farmers emigrated to new homes that allowed for their anti-modern ways. Nor was this the last issue for some Old Order dairy producers. For instance, in 1995, the Cream Marketing Board, which had previously remained autonomous, merged with the Milk Marketing Board to become the Dairy Farmers of Ontario, which began implementing changes to quota costs and production policies. Still, the campaign undertaken by various Old Order communities in order to continue the use of milk cans in the 1970s demonstrates the difficult position these groups had in navigating the legislative changes of the postwar period. Although these Old Orders had public support for their anti-modern ways that was heightened by fears of the deleterious social and environmental effects of high energy consumption, a defense of individual rights, including religious freedom, and a distrust of government and related bodies, this support was not enough to counter the general trend towards standardization and the adoption of new technologies in the dairying industry. The OMMB had sympathy for these farmers' plight, but ultimately believed the changes they had instituted were necessary to ensure safe, efficient milk production. The OMMB believed in policies that

ensured fair play, yet also sought to modernize farm practices, something all agricultural sectors promoted during this period. The foundational idea for the OMMB and its policies for fair farmer pricing was the belief that "milk [was] milk,"[79] however, in the case of some Old Order communities' resistance to bulk shipping and the continued use of cans, it appeared that concept could not always be evenly applied. This episode is yet another reminder that postwar agricultural transformation was not without its casualties. Multiple voices emerged in rural and urban Canada that defended and disavowed the measures taken to modernize and industrialize agriculture. Ultimately, however, dairy farmers in Ontario were required to adopt bulk tank milk systems in adherence to hygiene and production standards. The modernization of milk production in Ontario in the postwar era represented broader trends in North American agriculture. Whether involved in controlled marketing or not, farmers were required to increase their production and meet new industry standards that often required the adoption of new technologies. Old Order dairy farmers, similar to other dairy farmers, had to decide whether or not to accept the mandatory bulk tank systems and the associated costs, quit producing milk, or migrate in the hopes of finding jurisdictions which still allowed for old methods of production.

Notes

1 "Sect considers leaving Ontario: Mennonites vs. red tape," *Globe and Mail* (17 February 1967): 10.

2 J. Winfield Fretz, *The Waterloo Mennonites: A Community in Paradox* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1989), 181.

3 See Jodey Nurse-Gupta, "'Milk is Milk': Marketing Milk in Ontario and the Origins of Supply Management," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 28, no. 1 (2017): 127-156.

4 T. D. Regehr, *Mennonites in Canada, 1939-1970: A People Transformed*, vol. 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 3.

5 Royden Loewen, *Horse-and-Buggy Genius: Listening to Mennonites Contest the Modern World* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2016), 18.

6 William Janzen, *Limits of Liberty: The Experience of Mennonite, Hutterite, and Doukhobor Communities in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 245.

7 Ibid., 248.

8 Ibid., 294; 300-301.

9 Kraybill, Donald B., Karen M. Johnson-Weiner, and Steven M. Nolt, *The Amish* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2013), 9. Dwight W. Roth also provides a useful analysis of this process of modernization in his analy-

sis of "Aging and Modernization Among the Yoder Amish and Hesston Mennonites," MA Thesis, Wichita State University, 1981).

10 Loewen, *Horse-and-Buggy Genius*, 19-20; Kraybill, Johnson-Weiner, and Nolt also discuss the Amish's three-pronged approach to struggling with modernity as "*resistance*, *acceptance*, and *negotiation*"; *The Amish*, 8.

11 "Sect considers leaving Ontario: Mennonites vs. red tape," *Globe and Mail* (17 February 1967): 10.

12 Ibid.

13 Orland Gingerich, *The Amish of Canada* (Waterloo: Conrad Press, 1972), 198.

14 Wayne L. Fisher, *The Amish in Court* (New York: Vantage Press, 1996), 128-129.

15 "First "well-electrified farm" in Ontario: Richmond Guernsey Farm wins the Hydro Award for the most efficient use of electricity on the farm in Ontario," *Ontario Milk Producer* (April 1968): 10.

16 Ibid., 11.

17 George McLaughlin, quoted in "Milk cans are museum bound," *Ontario Milk Producer* (March 1977): 15.

18 F. H. Theakston, "Selecting a bulk tank," *Ontario Milk Producer* (June 1968): 8-9.

19 Ibid., 8.

20 Zero Manufacturing Company, "Zero Completely-Automated Vacuum Bulk Tank Cooler," [advertisement] *Ontario Milk Producer* (July 1968): 2.

21 "Bulk Milk Coolers." *Ontario Milk Producer* (July 1968): 12-13.

22 Dr. Al Myhr, quoted in R. H. Robson, "Bulk milk does not solve all quality problems," *Ontario Milk Producer* (September 1968): 4.

23 R. H. Robson, "Bulk milk does not solve all quality problems," *Ontario Milk Producer* (September 1968): 4-5.

24 "Group 1 Pool transportation policy," *Ontario Milk Producer* (November 1968): 8.

25 "Rationalizing transport is a mammoth task," *Ontario Milk Producer* (March 1969): 10.

26 "Milk cans are museum bound," *Ontario Milk Producer* (March 1977): 15.

27 "Milk can concession not likely for Amish," *Globe and Mail* (6 August 1977): 2.

28 Kraybill et al., *The Amish*, 275-276.

29 Fretz, *The Waterloo Mennonites*, 183.

30 Ibid., 199.

31 Steven M Nolt, *The Amish: A Concise Introduction* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 2016), 83.

32 "Milk can concession not likely for Amish," *Globe and Mail* (6 August 1977): 2.

33 "Ontario has room for its Amish farmers," *Toronto Star* (18 October 1977): B4.

34 "Milk cans are museum bound," *Ontario Milk Producer* (March 1977): 15.

35 "Ontario has room for its Amish farmers."

36 J. F. Jewson, "Can to Bulk Conversion," 12 September 1974, Milk Commission, 1977 (2), B356029, RG 16-11, Archives of Ontario (AO).

37 Ibid.

[38] Arnold Rupert to J. F. Jewson, 16 September 1974, Milk Commission, 1977 (2), B356029, RG 16-11, AO.
[39] Dairy Famers of Canada, *Canadian Dairy Farming Today* (Toronto: Dairy Farmers of Canada, n.d. [c.1957]), 8, F 4464-2-0-8, Dairy Farmers of Canada, B436273, F 4464, AO.
[40] J. Ross McLean, quoted in Dianne Spencer, "From cans to bulk – "an easy switch"," *Ontario Milk Producer* (August 1977): 10.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid., 11.
[43] Virginia Jalkanen, "Forced Out of Business: Dairy farmer ends career on sour note," unknown newspaper clipping, n.d., Milk Commission, 1977 (2), B356029, RG 16-11, Archives of Ontario (AO).
[44] Joseph E. Laframboise to William Newman, Minister of Agriculture, 26 September 1977, Milk Commission, 1977 (2), B356029, RG 16-11, Archives of Ontario (AO).
[45] William G. Newman to Mr. Joseph E. Laframboise, 18 October 1977, Milk Commission, 1977 (2), B356029, RG 16-11, Archives of Ontario (AO).
[46] Nolt, *The Amish*, 83.
[47] In the 1950s, Old Order Amish migrated to Ontario from the United States for a variety of reasons, including cheaper farmland, more accommodation regarding wartime measures, the ability to organize their own local school boards, and (at the time) less compulsory social security measures and fewer agricultural subsidy programs. For more on these factors, see Samuel L. Steiner, *In Search of Promised Lands: A Religious History of Mennonites in Ontario (*Kitchener, ON: Harold Press, 2015), 445, and Regehr, *Mennonites in Canada*, 133.
[48] Henry Hertzler, quoted in Trish Crawford, "Ordered to chill milk, Amish to quit Ontario," *Toronto Star* (1 August 1977): A4.
[49] Jacob Hertzler, quoted in Trish Crawford, "Ordered to chill milk, Amish to quit Ontario," *Toronto Star* (1 August 1977): A4.
[50] Trish Crawford, "Ordered to chill milk, Amish to quit Ontario," *Toronto Star* (1 August 1977): A4.
[51] John Laskin, quoted in "Law forces them to use hydro Amish farmers ask exemption," *Toronto Star* (18 October 1977): A2.
[52] Dorothy O. Pratt, *Shipshewana: An Indiana Amish Community* (Bloomington IN: Quarry Books, Indiana University Press, 2004), 133.
[53] "Ontario has room for its Amish farmers."
[54] Lorne Hurd, quoted in quoted in "Law forces them to use hydro Amish farmers ask exemption," *Toronto Star* (18 October 1977): A2.
[55] "Can shippers may convert to cream," *Ontario Milk Producer* (July 1977): 15.
[56] Lorne Hurd, quoted in quoted in "Law forces them to use hydro Amish farmers ask exemption," *Toronto Star* (18 October 1977): A2.
[57] "Ontario has room for its Amish farmers."
[58] Ian Hunter, quoted in "Amish plan appeal to ombudsman," *Toronto Star* (24 October 1977): A4.
[59] "Ontario has room for its Amish farmers."
[60] Janzen, *Limits of Liberty*, 2-3.
[61] Ibid., 3.

[62] Leslie C Barker, letter to the editor, "Amend Milk Act for Amish man urges," *Toronto Star* (2 November 1977): B5.

[63] See Susan L. Trollinger for a thoughtful discussion on how Americans are attracted to the Amish lifestyle because the Amish demonstrate for them the possibility of transgressing "the expectations of consumer culture and a "slower, more peaceful, more humane future"; *Selling the Amish: The Tourism of Nostalgia* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2012), 150.

[64] Ruth W. Sandwell, "An Introduction to Canada's Energy History," in *Powering Up Canada: A History of Power, Fuel, and Energy from 1600*, ed. Ruth W. Sandwell (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2016), 4.

[65] Ibid., 5; 19.

[66] Dimintry Anastakis, *Re-Creation, Fragmentation, and Resilience: A Brief History of Canada Since 1945* (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2018), 270.

[67] Douglas Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 306.

[68] Joan Froud, letter to the editor, "Ontario should leave Amish alone, she says," *Toronto Star* (28 October 1977): C5.

[69] Anita Flaherty, letter to the editor, "Ontario should leave Amish alone, she says," *Toronto Star* (28 October 1977): C5.

[70] Lillian Stork, letter to the editor, "Amish ruling dismaying," *Toronto Star* (2 November 1977): B5.

[71] "Let Amish continue dairy farming," *Toronto Star* (24 October 1977): C4.

[72] Nurse-Gupta, "Milk is Milk," 143.

[73] "Why's Ontario persecuting the Amish?" *Toronto Star* (30 October 1977): A8.

[74] Jonathan Manthorpe, "Quest for cheap milk homogenizes rural Ontario," *Toronto Star* (5 November 1977): C6.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Muriel Snider, "Farm Crisis: 1959: New May Have to Replace Old," *Globe and Mail* (9 October 1959): 23.

[77] "Milk plan approved by Amish," *Toronto Star* (11 November 1977): A2.

[78] Regehr, *Mennonites in Canada*, 134. In his assessment of some Old Orders rejection of modern technology, Regehr notes that some Old Order Amish adopted the compromise of on-farm diesel-generated power, while others did not.

[79] William Macpherson, OMMB Director of Finance, quoted in Douglas Sagi and Michael Moore, "McLaughlin determined to make plan work: Milk Marketing board sticks to Robin Hood role despite producers' anger," *Globe and Mail* (25 September 1968): B5.