Reginald Edwards
McGill University

Theory, History, and Practice of Education:
Fin de siècle and a new beginning

Abstract

The history and development of normal schools is traced through a summary of events that transpired in France, the United States, Britain, and Canada. The author examines the roots of several systems of teacher training and identifies specific institutions (normal schools) that played an important role in bringing to McGill University key persons interested in the training of teachers. Much of the article is devoted to linking the diverse influences that culminated in the establishment of the McGill Normal School, the Macdonald College for Teachers, and the Macdonald Chair of Education. While the article outlines the history of McGill's role in teacher education in Quebec and Canada, it also gives a broad perspective on the history of normal schools in Europe and North America, and their influences on teacher education today.

Résumé

L'histoire et le développement des écoles normales est retracée par un résumé des événements qui se sont produits en France, aux États-Unis, en Grande-Bretagne et au Canada. L'auteur analyse les racines de plusieurs systèmes de formation des maîtres et se penche sur certains établissements (écoles normales) qui ont contribué à faire venir à l'Université McGill des personnes clés s'intéressant à la formation des maîtres. Une bonne part de l'article est consacré aux diverses influences qui ont abouti à la création de la McGill Normal School, du Macdonald College for Teachers et de la Chaire Macdonald des sciences de l'éducation. Si l'auteur dresse l'historique du rôle joué par McGill dans la formation des maîtres au Québec et au Canada, il propose une vue d'ensemble plus étendue de l'historique des écoles normales en Europe et en Amérique du Nord et de leurs incidences sur la formation des maîtres telle qu'elle est dispensée aujourd'hui.

One hundred years ago in Washington, DC, in 1891, W. T. Harris, the Commissioner for Education in the Department of the Interior, authorized the issue of *Memorandum No. 8* of that year entitled "The Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States." This was but two years after the New York College for the Training of Teachers obtained a state charter, and eight years after the School of Education at the University of Chicago established the *School Review*. In England in the same year, 1891, school fees were abolished.[1] Meanwhile in Montreal, Sir William Dawson, who in 1857 became the first Principal of the McGill Normal School which was set up in the old High School on Belmont Street, in addition to being the Principal of McGill, was within one year of retirement, to be succeeded as McGill's Principal, after an interval of two years, by Sir William Peterson. Strands from these diverse sources were so intertwined as to effect the demise of the McGill Normal School; the establishment of the School for Teachers at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, and the appointment of its first head, George H. Locke, as professor of the History and Principles of Education; and the creation of the Macdonald Chair of Education, located on the McGill Campus, and the appointment of its first Professor, J. A. Dale.

As the title and contents of *Memorandum No. 8* of 1891 indicate, the term, Normal School, was in general use in America by the end of the nineteenth century. In fact, so established had the name become that in virtually all countries, save the United Kingdom, institutions for the training of teachers for public elementary schools are referred to, in texts published in English, as normal schools.[2] The nineteenth century usage of the term normal school has clouded for the late twentieth century a clear understanding of the origin and development of the term and the institutions so designated.

Historical Development of Normal Schools

The term "normal school" is the English version of the French *école normale* which may have gained credence from Sarah Austin's translation of the "Report on the State of Public Instruction in Prussia" which Victor Cousin presented to the French Minister of Public Instruction and Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1831. In this translation she replaced the term *écoles normales* with the expression "primary normal schools (*Schüllehrer Seminarien*)." In like manner, French texts and encyclopedia, writing of the United States, call their *écoles normales* "normal schools" but "*en Angleterre, les écoles normales d'instituteurs et d'institutrices sont appelées* 'training colleges'."[3]

Developments in France and the United States

The legal use of the term *école normale* in France first appeared in a law of October 30, 1794, approved by the National Convention (1792-1795), the successor of the Constituent Assembly and Legislative Assembly of earlier years. Educational historians have inferred the existence of the idea in Rolland's

Report (1768) which "proposed a national system of education to replace both the schools of the Jesuits and those of the Brothers of the Christian Schools," and "a higher normal school to train teachers for the Colleges (secondary schools),"[4] and in Mirabeau's (1789) proposal for "The Organization of a National Lycée."[5] Incorporated with these ideas has been the proposition of Condorcet (1791) that teachers for each grade of school should be prepared in the school above.[6] This proposition would require that a school exist higher than the lycées, to prepare teachers for the lycée, and saw its fulfillment in Lakanal's bill submitted to the National Convention for the creation of a national normal school. The original *école normale*, "where citizens of the Republic already schooled in the useful sciences should be taught to teach", engaged distinguished teachers such as Laplace, Lagrange, and Berthollet, but was open only from January to May 1795, after which the trainees were to return, each to his own district, and there open new *écoles normales*, though apparently none was established.[7] Commenting upon this phase, Cubberley, writing in the early twentieth century with twentieth century nomenclature, said of it, "a normal school, though, it hardly ever was."[8] Its later resurrection under a decree of Napoleon of March 17, 1808,[9] would see it more properly described as an *école normale supérieure*. This latter decree established *un pensionnat normal* for three hundred young persons who were to be trained in the art of teaching the arts and sciences – i. e., for teaching in the lycées. It was to this *grande école* that Victor Cousin, then 18, went in 1810. He was later to become *un répétiteur* or tutor there, and later still, the professor of philosophy and director. As Compayré indicated, the failure of the first *école normale* was not too tragic – it was an example which had been given, and the name for it had been found, in Lakanal's words –"*Ecoles normales – parce que ces écoles doivent être le type et la règle de toutes les autres.*"[10]

The 1794 decision of the National Convention "to create in Paris an *école normale* where citizens of the Republic already instructed in the useful sciences should be taught to teach" raises several issues: that individuals could be trained to become teachers; that teachers should have received training; and by whom and under what terms should training be provided, if indeed it were provided. Support for the proposition that training could produce teachers rested on the same tenets that training could produce members for other professions; that all teachers should be trained before employment raised issues of control versus freedom, issues still unresolved in many countries even today. Victor Cousin reported that the Prussian educational reforms, initiated after the defeat at Jena, and drawing upon the work and ideas of Pestallozzi, as developed in the Prussian law of 1819, invoked *Schülpflichtigkeit*, or the duty of parents, i.e., "the strict obligation of sending their children to school unless they were able to prove that they were giving them a competent education at home."[11] The law continued the foundation of primary normal schools, *Schüllehrer Seminarien*, in major towns, one for each department of the state. Each normal school would have approximately seventy pupils, age 16 to 18,

who would remain for three years, after which each successful candidate would be required, by contract, to teach for ten years in the school or schools to which he was assigned. But, exceptionally, "clergymen or skilled schoolmasters may train up masters for either village or town schools" under the supervision of a government appointed inspector.[12]

Under the Guizot Law (1833), France did not impose compulsion upon parents, granted equal rights to public and private schools, and, whilst primary education was not necessarily free of charge, indigent children were permittted to attend without payment. Thirty more normal schools were created, and, having abolished the exemption of members of religious orders from examinations for the teaching certificate, the Law proposed "that no schoolmaster should be appointed who has not himself been a pupil of the school which instructs in the art of teaching, and who is not certified, after a strict examination, to have profited by the opportunities he has enjoyed."[13]

In the United States, until the mid-nineteenth century, education was equated with the possession of knowledge and teaching as the imparting of the knowledge possessed. Hence it was important that there should be absolute mastery of just what was to be taught and one way of showing this was to demonstrate the ability to cope with the knowledge of the next higher grade – reflected later in the "lock-step" attributes of school systems. The oft-quoted exception to this general trend was the publication in the *Massachusetts Magazine* of 1789 of a letter attributed to Elisha Ticknor, in which he advocated the abolition of all the Latin schools, and the spending of the money on common schools, each presided over by a teacher who has been examined and certified as competent to teach the common subjects. In the early years of the Republic, of course, only the "first families" were in any position to secure for their children an education which stretched over more than a few scant years. By the 1820s a few voices were being raised in favour of some seminary for the provision of teachers for the district schools, and such a school was formed at Bethel, Maine, by a missionary from Vermont; the school however became more noted, historically, as the first to teach written composition to all its pupils.

It was Samuel Hall, the aforementioned missionary, who in 1823 wrote the first American text on teaching – *Lectures On School Keeping* – which proved to be a best-seller. At the same time, in Massachusetts, plans were being advocated for a training school where every one "would acquire a thorough grounding in the subjects the student is preparing to teach, [follow] a course of study upon the science and art of education, and [where] there would be a practice school."[14] But at the same time many schools were following the monitorial practices advocated by Bell and by Lancaster and their affiliated or supporting organizations.[15] Great attention was given to the statement by Bell in extolling his Madras system, "Give me 24 pupils today and I will give you

24 teachers tomorrow." In England, for example, schemes based upon the Lancasterian model produced, at Borough Road in London, the school that would be destined to become the first teacher training college (normal school) in that country. In New York State, on the other hand, the business of providing teachers was being left to the academies which added to their regular curriculum classes in the principles of teaching. There, whereas the 1827 Act of the State Legislature provided funds to, *inter alia*, "promote the education of teachers," the 1832 Report of the Board of Regents took what would now be regarded as a market-oriented viewpoint, when it said "the academies should become the nurseries of the instructors for common schools, leaving it to the interest of individuals to prepare themselves for the business of teaching, to the interests of the academies to provide the means of their preparation, and to the liberality of the school districts to offer sufficient wages to secure their services."[16]

Persistent lobbying in Massachusetts led to the legal creation of a board of education in 1837, which, at its first meeting, elected Horace Mann, then president of the Massachusetts Senate, as its secretary. In a private capacity he attended a meeting of supporters of the establishment of a seminary for teachers, one of whose members promised a donation of $10, 000 if the state would match the gift. This tactic often operated in reverse in which case the state would provide some funds and the locality would provide funds and/or premises for a normal school. By this means the first normal school, for the training of female teachers, was set up in Lexington, and a second one for both sexes at Barre. The New York model of using the academies was thus rejected, a fact not unassociated with the growing awareness of the contents of the Cousin Report (*vide supra*), either in the form of the Sarah Austin translation or as the *Digest* prepared by J. Orville Taylor, described as the Professor of Popular Education in the New York University, published in Albany in 1835.

At the opening of the Massachusetts normal schools Governor Everett embraced the Horace Mann precept that "the first business of a normal school consists in reviewing and thoroughly and critically mastering the rudiments or elementary branches of knowledge." The second part was the art of teaching, and the third important subject was that of the government of the school. Finally, "in the aid of all the instruction... there is to be established a common or district school, as a school of practice in which, under the direction of the principal of the normal school, the young teacher may have the benefit of actual exercise in the business of instruction."[17] The prodigious labours of the first principal, the Rev. Cyrus Peirce, to ensure its success included, in addition to the preparation and giving of lectures, the tending to the heating furnace in winter, sweeping snow from the steps, ensuring a supply of water, and shovelling the paths in order that his charges should not be deterred from their studies and their chosen profession. His success may be measured by the fact that some years later 122 out of a possible 154 students who completed the

course were teaching in the common schools of Massachusetts. The four hours of sleep he allowed himself daily contributed to his breakdown in health. Even so, within twelve months of the opening of the two normal schools 184 out of 430 members of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts voted for their abolition.

Background of British Normal Schools

In nineteenth century Britain, to the already existing social divisions were added religious differences between the Established Church, often associated with Tory politics, and Nonconformist denominations of more radical tendencies. Nowhere did this seem more apparent than in the field of education, and within education with the training of teachers. In 1801 Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker, opened a large one-room school at Borough Road, London, and "inscribed over it, 'All who will, may send their children and have them educated freely, and those who do not wish to have education for nothing may pay for it if they please.' His inability to pay assistants forced him to devise the plan of employing older scholars to teach the younger." Thus was born the monitorial system forever associated with his name. His organizing ability helped him to succeed but his impecunious behaviour sowed the seeds of his downfall. Subdividing the children into small classes, each class was assigned to a monitor, and one senior monitor organized the junior monitors. The whole was subject to disciplinary constraints, which gave an impression of military precision. Soon over one thousand boys were enrolled at Borough Road. Lancaster's greatest moment arrived when King George III sent for him and said, "It is my wish that every poor child in my dominions should be taught to read the Bible."[18] Lancaster's system found some response in New York and Philadelphia, and later in Montreal. Lancaster himself died in New York in 1838 following a street accident there.

A somewhat similar but less ambitious system, the Madras system named for the place where it was first observed and employed by Dr. Bell was appropriated by the Anglican Church which wished to see the education of the poor under their control, both as to catechism and content. Where Lancaster's supporters created the Royal Lancasterian Society in 1808, Bell's supporters, among whom were to be found the Archbishop of Canterbury and senior bishops, responded by creating in 1811 the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church. The Andrew Bell Trustees collected money and used it to establish schools, and with the advent of compulsory schooling they used the surplus to endow two chairs of Education (*vide 39 infra*). In 1810 other Quakers who had taken over the financial control of Borough Road formed the Institution for Promoting the British System for the Education of the Labouring and Manufacturing Classes of Society of Every Religious Persuasion, a title further changed in 1814 into the British and Foreign Schools Society. When, in 1833, public money was first

voted for the support of education (originally £20,000, and by 1839 £30,000) the money was simply handed over to the two societies for the building and support of their schools. As the numbers of these schools increased (and the National Society had some 230 schools with over 40,000 pupils by 1813) so also increased the number of monitors required. Lancaster had met this problem as early as 1805 when he began to board some of the monitors whom he was training. In that sense he had started the first residential training (normal) school in Britain.

The term "normal school" never attained the same degree of popularity in Britain as it did in France and the United States. Probably there were only four such instances. England created a Normal School of Design and later a Normal School of Science, Scotland had a Normal Seminary, and Wales had a Normal College. The Normal School of Design was created by the Select Committee of Council (of Parliament) in 1836, and an annual grant was given to it from 1841. Later it was absorbed into the Board of Trade as the Department of Practical Art, and then as part of the Science and Art Department before, in 1856, becoming a part of the newly created Department of Education. The later development of the Normal School of Mines was created by Donnelly (the modern Major General of W. S. Gilbert) in 1881, and Thomas Huxley was its first principal. It emerged much later as the Imperial College of Science. In Scotland, David Stow in 1826 founded the Glasgow Infant Society, which organized a school for infants, a model school, and a normal school. These were taken over by the Glasgow Educational Society which extended the Normal Seminary, as it was then entitled, to train more teachers. It received two parliamentary grants and eventually became the Free Church Normal (later Training) College. Its principal at the end of the century was John (later Sir John) Adams who was to play a role, at the beginning of the next century, on the Quebec educational scene.

In Wales the Nonconformists by 1850 had set up 90 schools under the British and Foreign Schools Society but were having difficulty in finding trained teachers to staff them. Intending teachers from Wales were advised to go to Borough Road, both for the excellence of the instruction and for the chance to improve their knowledge of English, especially spoken English. It was also cheaper to have students go to London than to set up a satellite college in Wales. Unfortunately for the plan, the monitorial system was abolished in 1846 to be replaced by a pupil-teacher system, which required every intending teacher to be apprenticed for five years from the age of 13; the passing of an examination, the Queen's Examination, at the age of eighteen, followed by training in a college for one or two further years. Schools in receipt of government funds were required to appoint trained teachers. At a meeting in 1856 in one of the leading Nonconformist chapels in Bangor, North Wales, it was resolved: "In order to secure the needful supply of teachers for the British schools in North Wales, a normal college for the education and training of

teachers be forthwith established."[19] The task of raising the necessary funds for its establishment from the various chapels in Wales took some years, the government giving only £2,000 in support. The college finally opened in temporary premises in 1858 and in its new premises in August 1862. Unlike all other training colleges established by the British and Foreign Schools Society its control was vested in a local management committee. In line with the tenets of the British and Foreign Schools Society it is undenominational, and it preceded the building of the first university colleges in Wales (Aberystwyth in 1872, Cardiff in 1883). It played an important role in the development of Welsh education. It is still active today.

As noted above, the end of the monitorial system and, in part, the realization that the task of educating all children could not be sustained by charity alone but required government support, also meant the end of the system of *memoriter* learning. This left the way open for the introduction of aims based upon the work of first Pestalozzi, then, later, Herbart and Froebel. The protest against verbalized teaching was led by Dr. Mayo and his sister who had visited Pestalozzi's school at Yverdun in 1819 and returned to set up a similar school at Epsom, for the children of upper middle-class parents, where Dr. Mayo taught until 1846. In the interim the Home and Colonial Infant School Society was founded in 1836 and began to train teachers specifically to work in such schools. Toronto Normal School drew upon this society for some of its inspiration, and was instrumental in helping towards the success of the Oswego Normal School (*vide infra*). But equally important for the training, certification and advancement of teachers was the creation of the College of Preceptors, established in 1846 and incorporated in 1849. It began to produce examinations for teachers, and its certificates of A.C.P. and F.C.P. (Associate and Fellow, respectively, of the College of Preceptors) were highly prized. In 1872 it named Joseph Payne as the first Professor of Education in Britain. Shortly thereafter the residue of the Andrew Bell Trust Fund (*vide supra*) was used in 1876 to endow chairs of Education at Edinburgh (Laurie) and St. Andrews (Meiklejohn). Each appointee bore the title of Profesor of the Theory, History, and Practice of Education. The lectures which Payne delivered in England, on the History of Education and the Great Reformers, the Philosophy of Education, and Psychology Applied to Education, set the pattern for most subsequent university departments of education, beginning with Cambridge in 1879.

For many, the most important event of the mid-century was the appointment of Dr. James Kay, later Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, as the Permanent Secretary of the Committee of Council of Education (of Parliament), a post he held from 1839 to 1849. He had had experience as a Poor Law Commissioner and had developed a pupil-teacher system for the education of pauper children, first at Norwich and later in London. In his new role he was able to introduce this system into general use and bring to an end the monitorial system of Bell and Lancaster. Prior to that in 1840 he founded, with private funds, an Institution for the Training of Parochial Schoolmasters at Battersea. It was here that the phonic method of teaching reading was first practised in England. Kay-

Shuttleworth hoped it would be the first of a number of state normal schools but when he failed to gain parliamentary approval Battersea was handed over to the National Society. With the National and the British Societies each having training colleges the pattern was set for voluntary control of teacher training institutions in England and Wales until 1890, and left schools organized on a denominational basis until the Act of 1870 which created school boards.

Education advanced by a series of small steps, some forward and one at least backward. The creation of the Education Department in 1856 was a forward step, the Revised Code of 1862 which introduced "Payment by Results" was a backward step. The reports of the inspectors set up by Kay-Shuttleworth were now sent to the Department of Education as well as to the managers of denominational schools, and government grants were still paid to the two societies. A big step forward was the creation of school boards, elected to provide education for the area for which they were responsible. At these elections women could vote and stand as candidates, something not possible at parliamentary elections until after the First World War. School building went forward rapidly, and in 1897 the school boards were given the power to compel attendance if they so desired. Children with sufficient attendance, who had reached Standard IV at age ten, could leave school, and irrespective of attendance and standing they could leave at age 13, but children could stay until 14 if they so desired. A new set of rules, arrived at by a committee of inspectors, and department officials, broadened the range of subjects which could be taught, and improved the standard of inspection. Pupil-teacher centres were created where these postulant teachers (pupil-teachers) would attend to complete their own formal education.[20]

Two powerful movements came to fruition in the 1890s. Faced with increasing competition from Germany and the United States many in Britain raised the question of technical inferiority and demanded that the educational system should provide more systematic teaching of science and engineering subjects. Some of this coalesced with the report of the Technical Education Commission in 1884. The founding of several university colleges gave an opportunity when many of them appointed scientists as their first principals. Cambridge was finally persuaded by the money and influence of the Duke of Devonshire to establish a research laboratory named after the Duke's ancestor, Henry Cavendish, but for many years failed to provide it with a permanent location within the university.

The second movement was a consequence of the tripling of the school population during the years 1870 to 1890, and of the school building program undertaken by the school boards. There was a great need for more trained teachers. In that same period only eleven new residential training colleges had been added to the thirty-three already in existence. The Birmingham School Board on behalf of many school boards had requested permission to use its

powers of taxation to set up its own teacher training college but had been refused. Others thought that the use of local taxes granted equally to denominational bodies was the key to produce more training colleges. Meanwhile some fourteen university colleges had been opened, four of them entirely for women located within the two older universities, the other ten all being in industrial areas. (They were later to be dubbed civic universities when they obtained full university status.) The notion grew that these ten university colleges might establish nonresidential training facilities to produce a higher level of teacher for the schools which were increasingly, through their "higher tops," providing a more than elementary education. The Cross Commission in 1888 had reported in favour of day students at both universities and university colleges, and in the regular training colleges. The Code of 1890 permitted them only in the former. Seven university colleges agreed to this in 1890, Cambridge in 1891, and Oxford in the following year. Thus began the Day Training Colleges. Pupil-teachers who, from age 14, had gone through the five-year cycle of preparation, i.e., as teachers (and had passed the Queen's Examination with a first-class standing) were to be allowed to attend a university (or university college) day-training department for three years, instead of the customary two at a training college, with financial support for the three years in return for a promise to teach for ten years. This would permit successful university graduation. One such former pupil-teacher enrolled as a day student at Oxford in 1896 and later became McGill's second Macdonald Professor of Education, Sir Fred Clarke.

In this handing of power to County Councils, London was a special case. Although there was a London County Council (LCC), the London School Board continued to exist. It even survived the next major Education Act of 1902, and it required a special Education (London) Act (1903) to regularize the position. However, in 1893 the LCC had set up a Technical Education Board under powers granted by the government. Its president for the first eight years was Sidney Webb, later Lord Passfield, and its first permanent secretary was Dr. William Garnett. Sidney Webb who wrote *Facts for Londoners*, and contributed to *Fabian Essays in Socialism* (1889), was elected for the constituency of Deptford in the LCC elections of 1892.[21] He was a thoroughly organized and informed individual who co-opted fifteen teachers to the Board and laid out a comprehensive plan for what he called his "vast capacity catching machine." By means of evening schools, by support of all schools, by the creation of polytechnics, and by scholarship funds he set out to discover and reward "the hidden treasures of genius and ability and practical wisdom which, as we believe, exist in almost as large a proportion among the children of the poorer sections of the community as among those more favoured in pecuniary fortunes."[22]

At that time London possessed no teaching university, though one university college and several teacher training colleges were located there.

London University was merely an examining university, which awarded degrees and certificates, including from 1883 a "Diploma in the Art, Theory and History of Teaching." Webb, through the Technical Education Board, supported measures to create a teaching university and in 1898 the London University Act gave it a new charter. When Webb decided that there was a science of education, then pedagogy could be regarded as a technical study and hence could be supported. The London School Board, still in existence, but functioning under the LCC, did not have the power to set up a teacher-training institution though it had several pupil-teacher centres. In June 1901 the LCC "adopted a report and recommendations from its Board relating to the creation of a day training college for men and women, the college to be under the Council's control but conducted in accordance with the regulations of the Board of Education and in conjunction with the university.[23] The report suggested that students could read for a bachelor's degree concurrently with their professional training. "The most interesting and important suggestion, however, was that the Senate should at once appoint a professor of the theory, history and practice of education and that this professor should be the principal of the proposed institution."[24]

Normal Schools in Quebec and Canada

In October 1902 the London Day Training College opened under the principalship of the professor appointed by the university, John Adams, later Sir John Adams, who was subsequently to play an important public and private role in Quebec education. As his biographer noted, "the year 1902 was another important landmark in Adams' career. He visited Canada; published an account of the Protestant schools of the province of Quebec; was appointed principal of the London Day Training College; and became the first professor of education in the University of London."[25] After a series of temporary occupancies the College moved into newly built premises in Southampton Row in 1907. They were furnished by the LCC, who paid Adams' salary to the university. In 1908 it gained provisional acceptance as a School of the University, and this was finally confirmed in 1931 when its title was changed to "University of London Institute of Education" (incorporating London Day Training College). In the long course of the negotiations leading to this, it had received powers to recommend students for the degree of M. A. in Education, and D. Lit. and later the Ph. D. It has become one of the world's pre-eminent institutions of higher education for teachers.

Canada, too, had its denominational Protestant rivalries and had, in addition, to contend with the provisions of the Quebec Act of 1774 where "for the more perfect Security and Ease of the Minds of the Inhabitants of the said Province, it is hereby declared, that His Majesty's Subjects, professing the Religion of the Church of Rome of and in the said province of Quebec, may have, hold and enjoy the free exercise of the Religion of the Church of Rome,

subject to the King's Supremacy...; and that the Clergy of the said Church may hold, receive and enjoy their accustomed Dues and Rights, with respect to such Persons only as shall profess the said Religion."[26] These religious differences were further confounded by differences of language and an immaturity in the exercise of democratic political control. Power was vested in governors and governors general, and the legislative councils which were appointed by them. Legislative assemblies where they existed had little power.

In educational matters, private schools were set up and the Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning was created in 1801, which was charged, *inter alia*, with the setting up of free or common schools. Unfortunately, M. Plessis, the Bishop of Quebec, led the opposition to the project, while the Royal Institution in its turn objected to the Methodists making use of one of its schoolhouses. The Fabrique Act of 1824 permitted the creation of one or more schools in each parish, but few were opened. On the other hand, education was a sufficiently important topic for the Assembly to spend much time discussing it – but largely as a means of seeking political control – and such legislation as was passed was usually designed to be of limited duration. In Lower Canada there was a Standing Committee on Education and Schools, and a Quebec Education Society, employing Lancasterian methods, existed. Many schools were built in the Eastern Townships as well as in the cities. Branches of the two English voluntary societies were set up in 1822 as the National and Foreign Schools Society and the Canadian Schools Society. Power was given to local boards of trustees by the Syndics Act of 1829 so that more schools could be opened, and soon approximately one-third of all children could receive some form of schooling. The Rebellion of 1837 brought to an end this period of the growth of common schools. Following the union of Upper and Lower Canada into the single province of Canada in 1840 under a new governor general, attention was focussed again upon education, less apparently for the sake of education but more as exercises in gaining political influence and control.

The new governor general, Charles Edward Poulet Thompson, a free trade member of the British Parliament for the newly enfranchised city of Manchester came to Canada with the promise of a title (Lord Sydenham), rather than to serve as the head of the Board of Trade at Westminster – a position he had held in a previous government. He had been educated privately, mostly in Leningrad and Moscow, where he also served on behalf of the family business. He had a reputation of being a witty, urbane individual, and a good administrator, with a good knowledge of languages. But in action he was devious, opposed to the Assembly, seeking to enlarge his own powers and to rule more by fiat than persuasion, relying on his appointed council to carry out his policies. More recently, in 1990, it has been remembered that he was the governor general who, as a possible reward to the Catholic clergy, which, during the Rebellion had counselled support for the lawful government, and for their possible future support, conducted a series of deals with the Seminary of St. Sulpice through

Father Chabanel, later Bishop of Quebec. He confirmed to them previously disputed land titles to the fiefs of St. Sulpice and Lake of Two Mountains, several thousand acres of land, which were to remain untaxed by the government. In return they were to educate more Catholic clergy and the poor of the parish of Notre Dame. There have been strong hints of chicanery in the passing of the Education Act of 1841, and even doubts as to his signature giving assent to the Bill before he died.

The elected Assembly of 1841 had 84 members equally divided between Canada East and Canada West. Canada East had twenty-two anti-Unionists, nineteen Unionists, and one Independent; Canada West had twenty-seven Reformers, eleven Tories, and four Independents. The anti-Unionists had French and English Reformers and Conservatives; in Canada West there were moderate Reformers and ultra-Reformers, moderate Tories and Family Compact Tories. All alliances between such groups were bound to be of a temporary nature, changing even from day to day.

The Education Bill was introduced on July 20, 1841, by the Solicitor-General Charles Dewey Day, later to be both Principal and Chancellor of McGill. He was a Vermonter who had settled in Montreal and was a presiding judge at the courts martial after the 1837 Rebellion, and one who handed out stiff sentences. The Bill as introduced was for a public and secular system of education for both provinces – as advocated by Charles Mondolet whose letters on education, published at this time, were well received.[27] Day subsequently wrote that "the measure was but a part of the great general system of national education which could take place in not merely the establishment of Common Schools but also of Model, and more especially of Normal Schools which would train up young men to act as teachers and instructors of this system. The establishment of Common Schools would be the foundation upon which all the rest would lie."[28] After second reading the bill was referred to Committee. One group wanted it referred to the Committee of the Whole House, others to a Select Committee of five legislators. In the end a committee of 23 members was set up, seven being the quorum. According to one of the members, at the third reading on September 14th, clauses X1 and XV1 were not read, but were re-inserted when it was sent to Lord Sydenham, the Governor General, for signature. The editor of the *Kingston Chronicle* concurred (in those days Parliament met at Kingston). Hodgins[29] has provided parallel texts of the Bill as presented and as ratified.[30] On the 5th of September, Sydenham who suffered from gout, fell from his horse, broke his right leg and opened a deep wound above the knee. After a few days his condition deteriorated, and he suffered spasms, intense stomach pains, and constriction of the throat from Sept 12th onwards. Parliament was due to be prorogued, so he arranged for General Clitherow, the senior military officer, to act for him.[31] He "prorogued Parliament on the morning of the 18th at twelve o'clock, giving at the same time, the royal assent or reservation to the bills which had all received Lord Sydenham's

decision, and almost all of them his signature." After dictating his will at about two o'clock on the 18th Sydenham was alone with his secretary and his chaplain until his death at seven o'clock on Sept. 19th.[32]

As Audet, the Quebec educational historian, writes, "Sections 11 and 16 of the Act were significant for their special provisions. For the first time in educational legislation the rights of the minorities were mentioned. Section 11 stipulated that when the conditions in the public schools are unacceptable to any number of persons it shall be permissible for the said dissident persons to signify collectively their dissidence and to establish schools which satisfy their needs. Section 16 defined the school organization for cities and towns which differed from that of rural municipalities. It called for a Board of Examiners divided into two departments – one composed of Roman Catholics and the other of Protestants."[33] (This was one of Mondelet's suggestions.) The essential elements of these two sections were incorporated in the 1867 legislation establishing a Dominion of Canada. Other elements of the 1841 Act established the position of superintendent of education, and the rights of municipalities to raise taxes to provide schools and support education, a right of taxation much deplored by the French, who were less amenable to being taxed. Although one post of superintendent of education was legislated, in effect, two were appointed, Dr. Ryerson for Canada West and Dr. Meilleur in Canada East, and these two shared the salary of the post.

The Normal Schools of Oswego, Worcester, and New York City

From the success of the Lexington Normal School established in Massachusetts in 1839, and under the continuing impact of ideas from Europe, further developments took place in the provision and conduct of normal schools. Three of these developments are worthy of special mention: Oswego, for its introduction of Pestalozzian ideas; Worcester, for the introduction of child study methods; and New York City, for the introduction of undergraduate and graduate degrees for those engaged in the study of education.

The Normal School at Oswego in upper New York State arose as the logical consequence of an attempt by the logically minded superintendent of the local schools, E. A. Sheldon, to improve the teaching in the lower grades of the elementary school. He sought to replace the *memoriter* methods of learning, i. e., the learning by rote of the printed content of textbooks, by an approach to which the children of the poor (many of them undisciplined and of Irish descent) could relate. Getting rid of the textbooks and substituting only pictorial material without printed explanation only upset the teachers. Fortunately Sheldon paid a visit to Toronto, where in a shop window he saw, readily available, educational material of the kind he was seeking. This, in turn, led him to the Toronto Normal School created by Ryerson, following the terms of the Canadian Common School Act (1846), and which was opened in 1847, just

eight years after Lexington. There Sheldon found, "to his surprise and delight . . . much more than he had ever hoped for. There were natural history pictures . . . published in London by the Society for the Promotion of Knowledge, (which in its school in London). . . were employed Krusi, the son of Pestalozzi's associate teacher, and Renier, who was associated with Pestalozzi at Yverdon. Indeed the (London) establishment was an embodiment of Pestalozzi's ideas and principles."[34]

Returning to Oswego, Sheldon worked hard, in school and out, to help his first grade teachers with the new material and the new approach, before, in the next year, continuing with the second grade teachers only to discover that his first grade teachers were being "snapped up" by neighbouring school boards at higher salaries than he could afford to pay. Therefore, in 1860 he obtained his board's permission to establish a training school attached to a high school to train still more teachers. This training school became a source of attraction to other superintendents and principals of other normal schools, and the "Oswego System of Object Instruction" became a popular topic at teachers' conventions. Its success was recognized in 1866 when its title was changed to that of Oswego State Normal School.

In 1871 Massachusetts authorized the building of a state normal school at Worcester, one which opened in September 1874. Worcester is important for two reasons: it started with an apprenticeship system and it required of its students that they undertake studies of the children they were to teach. The apprenticeship system operated towards the end of the second year when students would be attached to a particular teacher and school in Worcester but remain under the direction of the head of the normal school. The student would take part in the instruction, management, and general teaching work of the school; would act as a substitute for the teacher for lengthy periods, sometimes of more than one day at a time. This was in contrast to the more usual practice in normal schools of observing a model lesson given by a professor and then attempting to teach the same or a similar lesson in the model school. Extensive notes of daily activities and observations were kept. In the study of children, the texts of Sully and Bain[35] were in use, as well as texts of physiology, and those dealing with the mind/body dualism.

Education at Columbia

For many reasons the New York College for the Training of Teachers, the third one of these schools, was the most important not least because opinion was hardening that the normal schools were at an educational level equal only to that of high schools. It arose from the Industrial Education Association, in itself the successor to the Kitchen Garden Association which had tried to train some of the local girls in domestic duties. The Industrial Education Association's stated objectives were to facilitate the introduction of manual training

into the high schools. But where were the teachers of manual training, and if any such were to be trained would they be other than artisans or craftsmen? The first president of the Association, Mr. (later Dr.) Nicholas Murray Butler, assistant in Philosophy, Ethics, and Psychology,[36] with the connivance of President F. A. P. Barnard of Columbia, in 1887 asked permission to establish a course in pedagogy, a request which was refused. President Barnard in 1881 and 1882 in his Presidential Reports[37] had made strong pleas for the introduction of pedagogy into the Columbia curriculum, citing evidence of existing professorships, of Laurie[38] and Meiklejohn[39] in Scotland, and recent creations at Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin, but his pleas had fallen on deaf ears. In like manner his attempt to introduce co-education to Columbia only resulted in the creation of the separate Barnard College. Butler's request was refused on the grounds that few Columbia students would attend, and that the biggest attendance, if any, would come from noncollegiate students, and these would be mostly women.

Butler agreed to become a full-time president of the Industrial Education Association only if its scope was changed. With the philanthropic help of the Kitchen Garden Association's founders, the former home of the Union Theological Seminary was rented and a model school, renamed as the Horace Mann School, was secured; manual and industrial training were to be emphasized and special classes for teachers were planned for late afternoons, evenings, and Saturdays. A state charter was obtained in 1889 and in 1892 the name was changed to Teachers College. The charter authorized the trustees of the College "to grant and confer the degree of bachelor of pedagogy upon any person of the age of 20 years and of good moral character upon the recommendation of the faculty of the said college, setting forth that the candidate for the said degree has completed the course of study in the said college to the satisfaction of the faculty, and to confer the further degrees of master of pedagogy and doctor of pedagogy upon such conditions as to them may seem proper."[40] An attempt to become an integral part of Columbia after a five-year trial period was rejected, with the co-educational part again being a condition of rejection, but it was allowed the same-status relationship with Columbia as was enjoyed by Barnard College. But by 1900 the *Annual Report of Columbia University* testified that new agreements had been made with Barnard College and Teachers College, so that while retaining their separate existence, they each had become as much a part of the University as if their whole work was conducted under the university charter.

Pedagogy at other universities

Reference has been made above to the creation in certain universities of professorships of Pedagogy, or of Education, or History and Science of Education. Some of these were to grow into schools of education. One such was at the University of Chicago, itself established in 1892 by the philanthropy of

John D. Rockefeller. Under its first President, William Rainey Harper, and backed by the Rockefeller money, it was able to attract an excellent staff, helped by some extensive poaching from Clark University of staff who had been the core of the graduate school there. One aspect of Harper's tenure was the development of a University of Chicago Press for "William Rainey Harper considered his publication program to be the vital cement that would bind his whole vast academic edifice together."[41] One such publication was the *School Review*, issued by the School of Education, at first under the editorship of John Dewey in January 1893 but from 1900 to 1906 under the editorship of George H. Locke, then a professor in the School, with John Dewey as one of the members of the editorial board.

McGill's Normal School

Legislation affecting teacher education

The first normal school in North America had been legislated by the House of Assembly of Lower Canada in 1836 – *6 Wm IV, C. 12*[42] – which in its preamble said: "In order that the liberal encouragement granted to public instruction by the Legislature may not be unavailing, it has become urgently necessary to provide for the Establishment of normal schools from which Masters and Teachers properly qualified may be procured."[43] On the calls of the mayors of Quebec City and Montreal meetings of individuals of certain required qualifications were arranged, and committees of ten were created to prepare for and organize a normal school for each city. The government was to give an initial establishment grant and provide annual sums for expenses and teachers' salaries. A deputation was sent to Europe to secure the first teachers. Those appointed for the school in Quebec City never arrived, but both those for Montreal did and the normal school opened at the corner of Cathedral and St. Antoine Streets.[44] The training of females, where there were five or more applicants, was entrusted to the Ursuline Nuns at Quebec and Three Rivers, and to the Congregation of Notre Dame in Montreal. They met with more success than did the Montreal Normal School. Two Boards of Examiners were created in Canada East in 1846, and Meilleur, Superintendant of Education, sought to include experienced teachers on these boards. They would, in the first instance, decide whether or not teachers appointed by the local school boards of trustees set up under the Act of 1846 were qualified or not. At the same time he suggested three levels of diplomas and that three kinds of schools – model, academy and normal – should be able to produce a supply of teachers, always provided that the academies and model schools should be given the necessary funds to do the job. These proposals were obviously based upon American practice. School Inspectors were then appointed to help in securing some uniformity throughout Canada East, for the creation of more and more boards of examiners introduced widely differing criteria of approval. Finally an act was passed in 1851 (*14-15 Vict. Ch. 97*) "called The Inspectors' Act which bore

the preamble 'An Act to provide for the establishment of a Normal School.' "[45] Because of opposition it never functioned.

Chauveau, who succeeded Meilleur in 1855, looked again at the question of normal schools, and noting the American and British positions on state versus voluntary control, and the need for a Christian education, but recognizing the rights of conscience, proposed a solution by opening several normal schools to provide more freedom of choice and respect for individual rights. If the legislation were loosely drawn, then the government would have the latitude to fulfil these separate requirements. It was after the receipt of Chauveau's Report of 1856 that an act for establishing normal schools in Canada East was passed *(19 Vic. c54)*. [46]

Teacher education in Montreal

Meanwhile the Colonial Church and School Society had been active in establishing schools, and to provide teachers for them it opened a model school in Montreal and proposed to set up a normal school. Mr. W. H. Hicks, from England, was engaged and the model school opened in 1853. The normal school attracted few students but the model school prospered. Hicks was reluctant to use the monitorial approach, and was given the services of two local teachers to cope with the 180 pupils in the model school. By 1855 there were twenty-two students in the normal school, and the Society was receiving government grants for its operation.

It was at this time that McGill appointed William Dawson as its principal. Dawson who had been a student at Edinburgh and had a good reputation in Natural History, being a friend of Lyell, England's foremost geologist, and known by Huxley and Darwin amongst others, received the letter from McGill on the very day that he heard that a chair of Natural History at Edinburgh, for which he was an applicant, had been filled. Through Lyell he met Sir Edmund Head when he was governor of New Brunswick, and had travelled with him from England to Halifax on the same steamer. When Head was later appointed Governor General of Canada, he advised the governors of McGill to make Dawson their principal and Dawson was formally invited in a letter from Chancellor Day. After arrival in Montreal Dawson was asked by his governors to visit Head in Toronto to solicit funds for the university. This entailed a perilous and roundabout journey via Albany and Niagara in midwinter 1855.[47] Chauveau's proposal on normal schools was about to be presented to the Legislature by Cartier, and had been promised Head's approval. Head suggested that if McGill would associate itself with the project and support one of the normal schools, that would help McGill indirectly in the way of securing better prepared students. Chauveau and Head went further and suggested that Dawson, who, when superintendent of education for Nova Scotia had opened the normal school at Truro, should also accept the principalship of what became the McGill Normal School, in addition to that of McGill itself.

The Act was passed on October 6, 1856, and made operative by an Order in Council of January 30, 1857. Following Chauveau's advice the act was loosely drawn and Chauveau then issued on the same date, October 6, 1856, a set of Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, consisting of thirty-four chapters or sections. There were to be three normal schools, one to be affiliated to Laval; a second in Montreal, Jacques Cartier, which opened in the Chateau de Ramezay; and McGill. The first two were for Catholics and instruction would be given in French, but English would be taught. At McGill it would be for Protestants, the instruction would be in English but French would be taught. In the event, Laval University refused the charge and Laval Normal School was run by the superintendent and the government directly. The "art of teaching" was to be the major subject of instruction but there was a long list of other subjects to be taught. There were to be ordinary professors, who would be full-time appointments, and associate professors who could hold part-time appointments, and the three classes of diplomas – elementary, model, and academy – were to be offered, dependent upon initial qualifications and the length of training undertaken. Laval and Jacques Cartier had to provide separate model schools for boys and girls, and pupil-teachers must teach the children in the model school of the same sex as that to which they belonged. McGill Normal School enrolled female and male teachers in the same class, at a time when the parent university was teaching women in separate classes. Dawson justified this on the grounds that in the Normal School the majority of students were female and all its students were under a more severe disciplinary code than those in the university.

Arrangements with the Colonial Church and School Society enabled McGill to take over their model and normal school, guaranteeing employment to Mr. Hicks and with a promise to complete the training of its pupil-teachers under the rules and with the conditions under which they had been enrolled.

Ryerson, from Upper Canada, where the Toronto Normal School was already in operation, recommended to Dawson the service of S. P. Robbins , who came to McGill and served it faithfully as ordinary professor and later as principal of the Normal School for the next fifty years. The McGill Normal School opened on the afternoon of March 3, 1857, with an enrollment of thirty-five women and five men. Later in the same year McGill conferred the degree of LL. D. on Dawson; Edinburgh, having conferred the M. A. in 1856, was to confer the LL. D. in 1884. He became a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1862 and was knighted in 1882.

Dawson occupied the dual position of principal of the University and the Normal School until 1870 when Professor Hicks took charge. A series of attacks upon the functioning of the School, in particular one by I. E. Rexford, the Secretary of the Protestant Committee, brought about the illness of Hicks and he resigned in September, 1883, in favour of S. P. Robbins who remained until the Normal School closed its doors in May 1907. During the fifty years of its existence the School graduated approximately sixty teachers per year for a grand total of 2,989. Since more than that number of teachers was employed

in Quebec's Protestant schools, it is obvious that a great many teachers were still being approved by Boards of Examiners, including some who had failed the Normal course. Meanwhile Dawson continued as McGill's principal until 1893, and a search for his successor was, in 1892, entrusted to one of McGill's prime benefactors, Donald A. Smith, later to become Baron Strathcona. He was "member of Parliament for Montreal West, governor of the Hudson Bay Company, a principal shareholder in the Canadian Pacific Railway and President of the Bank of Montreal, (thus) he had his eye on the imperial scene as the stage on which to play his final role."[48] His choice fell upon William Peterson, Principal of the newly endowed and recently created University College of Dundee, at that time a teaching university without the power to confer degrees. (Students sat for the external degrees of London University.) A classical scholar of some distinction, Peterson wished to see his College incorporated into the older, established degree-granting St. Andrew's University, and remained in Dundee until that had been arranged in 1895. Peterson, too, has been described as being cast within the imperial mode. It is certain that he returned to Britain each year from the end of the May term until the beginning of the fall term, usually in October.

Peterson was a skilled administrator, and presided over a great expansion of McGill, with many changes introduced, both administratively and in terms of building expansion, much of the latter through the generosity of his next door neighbour on the Prince of Wales Terrace (now the site of the Bronfman Building), Sir William Macdonald, who proved to be McGill's greatest benefactor. Macdonald was a stubborn man, determined to carry out plans of his own creation in his own way. Peterson always believed that the only way to convince Macdonald was through the provision of facts and economic argument. One of Macdonald's early benefactions of direct value to education was the payment for a survey of the Quebec Protestant Schools in 1902, a survey carried out at the suggestion of Peterson. Peterson's choice to carry out the survey was a fellow Scot, Sir John Adams, formerly of Aberdeen and Glasgow, recently chosen as London University's first Professor of Education. The visit took place between the 23rd of April and the 30th of June, and the Report, printed by the University of Aberdeen Press (whether on the grounds of confidentiality or price, is not known) does not appear to have been addressed either to Macdonald, to Peterson, or to the Protestant Committee. Many of the one hundred and thirty-seven pages of the Report repay reading today, and many of his remarks on the role and position of the English minority are still relevant.

On his visits he was accompanied by H.M. Tory, from McGill's Department of Mathematics, a future president of the Universities of Alberta and Carleton, and founder of the Science Council of Canada. With due regard to the cost of the survey Adams was careful to point out that "in no case did we spend any time in school hours in doing anything else than visiting schools."[49] The Report lists all the academy, model, special secondary schools, and city of Montreal schools visited and speaks of the 120 district schools also visited. He

taught classes in many schools, and observed many teachers at work. He commented favourably on the city of Montreal schools, where there was a separate superintendent of schools, and half-yearly promotion. Promotion to their secondary schools was by competitive examination. He found that their secondary schools did not "fall into line" with the general provincial system of district schools, model schools, and academies. District schools offered four years of elementary instruction and had one teacher; model schools must have two teachers, one of whom must have a model school diploma, whereas an academy must have three teachers, one of whom must have the academy diploma. To Adams, the model school was an elementary school with a higher department and he found no justification for the name, suggesting instead that a grade system would be better, with grades I-IV, V-VII, and VIII-X. "Generally speaking," he says, "model schools have a run down look," but "academies are excellently provided in the way of buildings," and of those he saw in Montreal, with the exception of Ann Street, "can stand comparison with similar buildings anywhere."[50]

"The teacher then is the crux of the whole question. Given a good teacher all the rest follows,"[51] but for school boards the emphasis was on finding a teacher, any teacher, and often as cheaply as possible. Much of the blame he placed on the annual contract for teachers which led to an annual withdrawal from the pool of elementary teachers of 20 to 25% each year, and to 82% changing schools from one year to the next. At the model school level he found excellent female principals but, with exceptions, "the ordinarily poorly paid Principal is at his post because he can find nothing better to do."[52] The training provided at the Normal School for elementary school teachers was either for four months (for those with higher entrance qualifications) or for nine months for the others, the former receiving an elementary diploma and the latter receiving an advanced elementary diploma. While the prospectus of the Normal School states that its essential work is training to teach, Adams found that much of the work was such as would be found in a higher grade school (English terminology). What he termed the "mere culture subjects, the matters afterwards to be taught to pupils" were not too well known, and he believed that in the Normal School they were not dealt with as a study of pedagogy but as a high school course.

The McGill Normal School and the Macdonald Chair of Education at McGill

In order to qualify for the academy diploma, graduates of British or Canadian universities were required to spend fifty half-days at the normal school and to pass an examination on the subject matter of a course of lectures on pedagogy.

> Yet the results are far from satisfactory. There is a singular hostility in the tone adopted towards the Normal School by Graduates who have gained their Academy Diploma after their course there. They have little good to say about their training. . .

> their attitude is more that of tolerant contempt than anything else, an attitude very familiar to all who have had anything to do with the practical training of Teacher Graduates.[53]

He attributed the cause to the fact that the practical part of the work was done outside of the University and by non-University officers.

> The only cure is to raise the subject of Education to University rank and associate the Professor of Education with what is now, by a convenient figure, generally known as the clinical work of his Chair. The new university at Birmingham began by including Education as an integral part of one of its degrees: the other Universities of the same rank are following the example: in the Scottish Universities, Education has for some time ranked as a regular Arts subject.[54]

He underlines that

> . . . it is cause for regret that there is not yet a Chair of Education, or even a Lectureship in that subject in McGill University. In view of the specially close connection between the University and the Education of the Province there is a claimant need for such a Chair. McGill, which is admirably equipped in other directions cannot afford to lag behind in such an important department.[55]

Adams returns to the charge at several later points in his Report. For example, "if the experience of other countries supplies any guidance, the Province must look to the University to supply the breadth of view that is absolutely necessary to check the natural tendency among teachers to routine and rule of thumb."[56] Again, "the closer the tie between the McGill University and the Teaching Profession, the better for the Profession in the Province."[57] And, most strikingly, in the final paragraph of the Summary of the Report, "We must look to the University to maintain the status of teachers in the Province. There is great need for a Chair of Education at McGill in order that the standing of the subject may be acknowledged and that the Professor – through his connection with the University on the one hand and the Normal School on the other – may establish that correlation between theory and practice that enables teachers to make the most of themselves and their pupils."[58] Here indeed was a powerful array of facts, and opinions based upon facts, that Peterson might use at a later date. The immediate result seems to have been a healthy friendship which sprang up between the two Scotsmen, born within a few months of each other, but from different educational traditions. Later, Adams seems to have functioned as the agent of McGill, or certainly the eyes and ears of Peterson when the question did arise of recruitment to McGill.

Armed with the Adams Report of 1902, with its emphasis upon the teachers and their training, the logical next step was to conduct some examination of the McGill Normal School itself, its buildings, staff, curriculum, and

role in Quebec society. For this purpose a Canadian was chosen, Professor G.H. Locke, of the University of Chicago School of Education, who was familiar with both Canadian and American practices. He had graduated with honours in classics from the University of Toronto in 1893, stayed on for an M.A. and held a one year's appointment as lecturer in classics, all attributes likely to attract Peterson. He spent two years at Harvard as Professor, substituting for a professor on sabbatical leave, and there he introduced, for the first time in the United States, university-supervised teaching practice for university graduates. On moving to Chicago he was a professor in the School of Education and served under John Dewey who was the editor of the *School Review*, published five times a year by the School. He later became managing editor, and his editorial comments on a wide variety of topics were of a very high order. The *School Review* was regarded as the leading American publication on secondary education. He met Peterson several times and made his formal visits to the Normal School on December 8, 9, and 10, 1903. By early January Peterson was asking for an early report, since the Normal School was seeking government funds. In reply Locke said that he was making a thoroughly practical report calling for action upon the first things, and saying, "I believe that the improvement of the material environment of the children in the Model Schools and of the students in the Normal School the great necessity."[59] A handwritten Report dated December 29, 1903, followed.

The Report criticized the building which, "in its original state may have been useful and ornamental but as it stands it has neither of these virtues."[60] The lighting was fair, the ventilation poor and the walls dirty. The library and reading room was "a dreary place" and intending teachers could not there acquire any of the social graces by which teachers might improve their role in society. Even so, it was better than the model schools. How could lessons in domestic economy, physiology, and hygiene be conducted in such surroundings without contradicting the theory upon which they were based. He could hardly find words adequate to express the effect made upon him by his visit to the model schools. If money were available he would advise a new building. He liked the idea of a McGill professor coming to deliver lectures on science to normal school students, but felt it would be better if the McGill laboratories were thrown open to them as well.

He was particularly concerned with the effect upon the one hundred or so females, from all parts of rural Quebec, from farming families and others, having to live in boarding houses in Montreal. How much better to have a hostel with amenities, and space for them to practice their domestic skills acquired from their course in domestic science. The principal of the Normal School was a lecturer in McGill University to the few students preparing themselves to teach in academies, but with no course mapped out. Here was an opportunity for McGill unique, in Canada, to match Columbia University with its Teachers College, the University of Chicago with its School of Education, and with

Harvard moving in the same direction. "My recommendation," he wrote, "is that the person who is head of the Normal School be Professor of Education in McGill University, thus making more definite and dignified the relation that now exists." And he added, "there seems to me to be no good reason why in this way McGill should not in the very near future be placed in the front rank of American universities and be the Canadian representative of progressive educational practice."[61] He indicated that courses on the history of education and on educational theory would be given in the University by the Professor of Education. The course in the history of education might very well be given in the third year of the College course, and as at Harvard, and at all great universities be counted towards any arts or science degree – just as the History of Government or any other such social institution.

With this ammunition to hand, what would Peterson do? On the one hand he had to deal with his board of governors, and on the other with the Protestant Committee, and the Teacher Training Committee, as well as his own inclinations for the changes he saw as necessary. His major benefactor, Sir William Macdonald, became interested in the consolidation of schools, initiated in Quebec by the Protestant Secretary of Education, Dr. Parmelee, as saving the district schools, and ending some of the rural isolation. At the same time through the Macdonald-Robertson enterprise, and influenced by the work of Adelaide Hoodless, a tireless campaigner for the teaching of domestic science, Macdonald had opened a Macdonald Institute at Guelph. It was apparent that he had ideas about perpetuating the name of Macdonald through the creation of Macdonald Chairs, by donating Macdonald Park, and by building the Macdonald Engineering Building. He had already assisted greatly in the introduction of manual training into schools, and into the Normal School. His interests around 1904 turned to rural problems, and horticulture and agriculture. A building to respond to these needs was planned by him, and finally located at Ste. Anne de Bellevue. We know now that three schools were located there, and that the College was affiliated and under the control of the corporation of McGill, but was it always intended to be that way? Snell[62] suggested that that was always the intention; Frost disagrees.[63] It is not easy to decide which path Peterson was following.

It was known that Robbins was to retire from the principalship of the McGill Normal School so that a replacement was necessary. Should his successor be drawn from within, the favoured candidate being Professor Kneeland, Professor of English? Should search be made outside? In Canada? In Britain? In the United States? What of Adams' suggestion for a Chair of Education within McGill? Unfortunately Peterson's correspondence has not always been filed, so there can only be speculation. It is known that some letters from English and Scots correspondents spoke of a head for the Training College, but some of the American correspondence had reference to the Chair of Education. Even his friend Sir John Adams was confused. The building of

Macdonald College was begun in April 1905, though later the contractors left the site and it had to be built by local labour. On November 28, 1905, the newspaper, *The Witness*, reported that the Normal School was not going to Ste. Anne after all. On Dec 14th it suggested that it might go to Quebec City. A move in the Legislature to end teacher training was defeated but a move to provide residences for women from country districts attending the Normal School was supported. There were suggestions that the Protestant Committee was ruled from Montreal, and that a Normal School should be located in or near Sherbrooke. Stanstead College offered training facilities for Methodists within their College. An extensive debate took place in the legislature in late February 1906, reported in full in the *Montreal Herald* of the 28th.

In November and December, 1905, letters to Peterson from various officials in Westminster, in the Board of Education, and the Scottish Branch, suggested three names, Gettins, Dumville, and Whelpton, as good candidates for the head of the Training College. (All subsequently achieved academic recognition in Britain.) But letters in November of 1906 were obviously concerned with the appointment to a chair, and names such as Findlay, who went to Manchester, and Keatinge, who was Reader at Oxford, were suggested. Two letters from Dean Russell of Teachers College, Columbia University, in June 1906, clearly implied consideration for a chair of education, two such names being Cubberley and Suzzallo, both of Stanford. Two other professors were also suggested, both being Canadians by birth. There was one interesting footnote. Russell expressed the hope that Peterson would find his man on this continent. Russell said he knew the men who count for something in England and Scotland and was sure his own listed men were better. "England in particular has a long way to go before arriving at what I consider to be a fair understanding of public education." Elsewhere he was to say, "Please give a further word as to what you intend and I will write you more at length."[64]

By November 1906 word was coming from the Board of Education in England, confirmed by a contact in the Scottish Office, that J. A. Dale was the man. He was described as the most useful, and most brilliant member of their inspecting staff for university training departments. "He is, as you know, an A1 scholar (in classics)... he is also an extraordinarily keen and able metaphysician and psychologist, and he has the soundest judgment on matters of pedagogy amongst all my acquaintances – bar none."[65] It was suggested that he might be "borrowed" for a couple of years, though he could ill be spared at the Board. "He is a charming man, a most taking lecturer and of course a master of all the real field of educational thought."[66] In March 1907 Dale was writing to ask if it were possible to be told whether or not his services would be required in that year, and in May he was rejecting an "experiment" – presumably two years secondment followed by a possible job offer – but agreeing to meet Peterson when he "came over." Presumably that was when he received a definite offer, for the Annual Report for 1906-7 contained the advance notice

that an appointment had been made to the endowed Macdonald Chair of Education in the Faculty of Arts in the person of J. A. Dale, M. A., of Merton College, Extension Lecturer in Education and Literature in the University of Oxford. He took up his appointment in September 1908. A series of lectures was given in the academic year 1907-08 by Mr. E. B. Sargant, Educational Advisor to the High Commissioner for South Africa, who returned the offered fee in order to provide books for a working collection of books for the new Chair of Education.

Macdonald College for teachers

The Annual Report for 1906-7 contained news of Macdonald College, of a report laid before the Corporation of the University on October 21, 1906, that the College would be :

1. For the advancement of education; for the carrying on of research work and investigation, and the dissemination of knowledge; all with particular regard to the interests and needs of the population in rural districts.

2. To provide suitable and effective training for teachers and especially for those whose work will directly affect the education in schools in rural districts.[67]

There was a formal statement of membership of the Normal Training Committee of Macdonald College. Of the eight members, one would be the Professor of Education in McGill University. Earlier in the report it was clearly stated that "it had been from the very first, part of the declared intention of the founder of Macdonald College to make effective provision, on modern lines, for the training of teachers, especially the large body of elementary teachers whose work lies in the rural schools of the Province,"[68] but nowhere does it state who was appointed to take charge. From correspondence of G. H. Locke with Principal Peterson it appears as though Peterson asked him if he were interested. Locke had resigned from Chicago at the time of the retirement of its first president, W. Rainey Harper, and at the advent of President R. M. Hutchins, and to tend to his sick wife. He had taken employment on a temporary basis for Ginn and Company in Boston, but intimated that he missed his academic contacts and contacts with students. Apparently he was not clear as to what he was being offered by Principal Peterson. In terms of his own report he thought it might entail a Chair at McGill linked with control of the Normal School, but he was prepared to bow to Peterson's desires and judgments. Perhaps he should be flattered in reading the Annual Report for 1907-08 where he must have read:

> Another department of the Faculty of Arts in which a forward movement is to be noted is that of Education. The work of the Teachers' Training School at Macdonald College is now to be supplemented by a fully-endowed Chair of Education at McGill itself; and the interrelation of these two agencies will enable the

> University to take rank henceforth, in this department, with some of the most progressive Universities of the United States. Columbia, for example, has its Teachers College and Chicago its School of Education: and now in McGill we have succeeded in putting the Training of Teachers pretty much in line with the other Professional Faculties – Law, Medicine, Applied Science and Agriculture.[69]

Summary

We have now come full circle. Without the development of normal schools there would have been no McGill Normal School on Belmont Street, no Teachers College at Columbia with which to rank, and no Chicago School of Education from which to draw someone to report on the McGill Normal School and to become the first head of the School for Teachers. Without a Normal Seminary in Scotland there would have been no John Adams to report on Protestant education and to point out the need for a Chair of Education at McGill. Without Sidney Webb and his Technical Education Board there would have been no London Day Training College to give Sir John Adams the first London Chair of Education, and without the Adams and Locke reports no School for Teachers at Macdonald College at Ste. Anne de Bellevue. But without Principal Peterson, his Oxford friendship with P. A. Barnett, his knowledge of the work of Laurie and Meiklejohn, and his ability to persuade Sir William Macdonald to provide the money for the endowment of the first Chair of Education at McGill, there would have been no appointment as the first holder of that Chair of James A. Dale.[70]

REFERENCES

Adams, Sir John. (1902). *Report on the Protestant School System of Quebec*. Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen Press.

Cubberley, E. P. (1920a). *History of education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cubberley, E. P. (1920b). *Readings in the history of education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gordy, P. (1891). *Rise and growth of the normal school idea in the United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

La grande encyclopédie: Inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts. Paris: H. Lamirault et Cie., n.d.

McGill University Archives (MGA).

Morgan, H. J. (1865) *Sketches of celebrated Canadians*. Montreal: Worthington.

Watson, Foster (1921-1) Encyclopedia *and dictionary of education*, 4 volumes. London: Pitman.

NOTES AND NUMBERED REFERENCES

1. This was three years after the establishment of County Councils (1888), followed by three successive Acts of Parliament which gave to these County Councils the right to levy taxes for technical education (1889), the allocation of parts of the proceeds from a tax on whisky for the same purpose (1890), and given power to

award scholarships (1891). By Regulations of the Board of Education, University Day Training Colleges were set up in 1890. In the following year Sidney Webb became Chairman of the London County Council's Technical Education Board.

2. In the U. K. they are referred to as Training Colleges, with or without the prefacing word Teacher.
3. Compayré, G., in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, p. 375-376.
4. Cubberley, E.P. (1920a), p. 510.
5. Cubberley, E.P. (1920a),. p. 512
6. Cubberley, E.P. (1920a), p. 514
7. Watson, F. Vol. iv, p. 48
8. Cubberley, E.P. (1920a), p. 517, footnote.
9. Marion, H. *La Grande Encyclopédie*, p. 369. See also Barnard, H., *American Journal of Education*,Vol. xx, p. 324.
10. Compayré, G., *La Grande Encyclopédie*, p. 374.
11. Cousin, V., *Rapport sur l'état de l'instruction publique en Prusse*. Paris, 1831 (Translation by Sarah Austin). London, 1834, pp. 105-108, in E.P. Cubberley (1920b), p. 486.
12. Ibid .
13. Cubberley, E.P. (1920b), p. 459. See also *Inventaire*, p. 374.
14 Carter, J. C., in *The Boston Patriot*, 1824. See also Gordy, p. 13.
15. Watson provides separate information upon Lancaster, p. 480, and a comparison of Bell and Lancaster, p. 950. See also Leach, F. (1968), *History of education in Great Britain.*, 7th Edition, pp. 206-210. London: University Tutorial Press. *The Dictionary of National Biography* provides a good account of Alexander Bell and his work.
16. Reports of the Regents of the University for 1882, pp. 10-12 (excerpted in Gordy, p. 28).
17. Gordy, P., p. 44.
18. Watson, F., p. 481.
19. Bangor Normal College Centenary Publication, 1958.
20. The wide divergences between the standards and effectiveness of school boards in towns and cities and those in rural areas raised pressure for a more uniform system, but the rural areas under the control of the church and the squires resisted any such move. They gained their point, but as a sop the Prime Minister conceded the abolition of school fees in all elementary schools in 1891, and the same per capita grants were paid to board and voluntary schools alike. The next step was to reduce the number of school boards, and prevent the continued emergence of new politicians who had learned their politics and administrative skills around school board elections and their administrative practices. This was done by handing over the control of education to the recently formed County Councils, which contained all areas not occupied by chartered towns and cities, and to towns and cities. Elections to office in these were not open to women nor did women have the right to vote at such elections.
21. Margaret Thatcher was not elected there in national elections in 1950 and 1951.
22. Armytage, W. H. G., *Four hundred years of English education.* Cambridge: University Press, 1970, p. 1 75.
23. *Jubilee Lectures of the Institute of Education*, 1951. London: Evans Bros., 1952, p. 201.
24. Ibid, p. 214.
25. *Dictionary of National Biography.*
26. Reid, J. H. S. et al., *Source book of Canadian history.* Toronto: Longmans Green, 1959, p. 57.

27. Morgan, H. J., p. 536.
28. Rexford, O. B., *Teacher training in the Province of Quebec*. McGill University. M.A. Thesis, 1936, pp. 50-51.
29. Hodgins, J. G., *Documentary history of education in Upper Canada*. Toronto: Wm. Briggs.
30. Adams, H., *The education of Canadians 1800-1867*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1968, p. 47.
31. Morgan, H. J., p. 406.
32. Morgan, H. J., p. 385.
33. Wilson, J. D., Stamp, R. M., & Audet, L. P. *Canadian education: A history*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall, 1976, p. 172. See also Rexford, O. B.
34. Gordy, P., p. 63.
35. Watson, F., p. 138. *The Dictionary of National Biography* has fuller details on Bain. Bain was the author of the widely used text, *Education as a science*. See Compayré, G., *History of pedagogy* (Translation by W. H. Payne). Boston: D. C. Heath, 1903, pp. 556-563 for a commentary on this text. Sully, a protegé of Bain, and friend of William James, was the author of *Outlines of psychology*, and of *The teacher's handbook of psychology*, texts which were used by James at Harvard before he produced his own texts.
36. In those days a professor was the titular head and had one or more assistants. Butler at that time was an assistant.
37. Butler, N. M., *Across the busy years*. New York: Scribners, 1939.
38. Watson, F., p. 963.
39. Watson, F., p. 1068. Both these chairs were endowed from surplus funds of the Andrew Bell Trustees. See Leach, F., p. 556. Principal Peterson was at the University of Edinburgh when Laurie was there and at Dundee when Meiklejohn was at St. Andrews.
40. Gordy,P., p. 107. He had noted on p. 106 that the College was not to provide a secondary education. All entrants must have had a secondary education.
41. Brubacher, J. W., and Rudy, W., *Higher education in transition*. New York: Harper, 1958, p. 185.
42. The legal expression for an act passed in the sixth year of the reign of King William IV, being the 12th Act of that year.
43. Audet, L.P. Ibid, pp. 175-178.
44. During the Rebellion the School was used to house an in-lying piquet (a mobile guard of local volunteers) and so presumably was unable to fulfil its proper function. Of its supervisory committee, the president was L. J. Papineau, its secretary was T. S. Brown, and its treasurer was Mayor Viger. After the Rebellion the president, secretary, and Dr. O'Callaghan, a board member and member of the Legislature were charged with High Treason.
45. Audet, L.P., Ibid, pp. 175-178.
46. Ibid.
47. Dawson, J. W. (1902). Fifty *years of work in Canada*, p. 50. London & Edinburgh: Ballantyne, Hanson and Co. (Sir Charles Lyell was the foremost geologist of his time.)
48. Frost, S. B. (1984). McGill University: Montreal., p. 5. McGill-Queens University Press. In the earlier volume pp. 292-293, dealing with the election of Donald Smith as Chancellor, Frost noted, "It (the choice) proved a crucial one. It gave Smith the determining voice in choosing a successor to Dawson, and thereby it put McGill firmly under those imperial influences which were to characterize it so profoundly in the early decades of the new century."

49. Adams Report, p. 1
50. Adams Report, pp. 9-11.
51. Adams Report, p. 22.
52. Adams Report, p. 28.
53. Adams Report, p. 39.
54. Adams Report, pp. 39-40.
55. Adams Report, p. 41.
56. Adams Report, p. 42.
57. Adams Report, p. 43.
58. Adams Report, p. 137.
59. MGA. Letter: Locke to Peterson. Jan 7, 1904.
60. MGA. Locke's Report, p. 1.
61. Ibid, p. 9.
62. Snell, J. F. (1963). *A history of Macdonald College*. Montreal: McGill University Press.
63. Frost, S. B., *vide supra 48*.
64. MGA. Letter: Russell to Peterson.
65. MGA. Letter: P. A. Barnett to Peterson. Barnett was a contemporary and personal friend of Peterson at Oxford in the 1870s. He became a university lecturer, and later one-time Principal of Borough Road Training College. At the time of his letter he was responsible for the supervision for the Board of Education of all university teacher training departments.
66. Ibid.
67. McGill University Annual Report for 1906-07, p. 11.
68. Ibid, p. 9.
69. McGill University Annual Report for 1907-08, p. 9.
70. Edwards, R. (Unpublished Mansucript). *The First Macdonald Professors of Education*. 1908-1935.

Reginald Edwards, now Professor Emeritus in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counselling, McGill University, has taught at universities in England, the United States, and Canada. He was a one-time president of the Comparative and International Education Society, and has been a contributor to several journals and the World Year Books of Education. He was the first elected McGill Senator from the Faculty of Education.

Reginald Edwards, professeur émérite au département de psychopédagogie et counselling de l'université McGill a enseigné dans plusieurs universités en Grande-Bretagne, aux États-Unis et au Canada. Il a été président de la Société canadienne d'éducation comparée et internationale et a publié de nombreux articles dans des revues savantes ainsi que dans les World Year Books of Education. Il a été le premier membre de la faculté des sciences de l'éducation à être élu au Sénat de l'Université McGill.