THE McGILL NORMAL SCHOOL — A BRIEF HISTORY

1857-1907

A thesis
submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts

Administration and Policy Studies in Education
McGill University

February, 1982

ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses some aspects of the McGill Normal School from 1857 to 1907. This period spans the history of the School, after which, it became the School for Teachers at MacDonald College. An attempt is made to interpret the role of the school and this is done by noting some of the problems concerning its founding and operation, by focusing on the expressed views of some of the leaders of Lower Canada who were closely connected to the school, and by examining the financial resources apportioned to the school for the incomes of the staffs, for the upkeep of the buildings and extensions, and for student needs, since the amount of money set aside for a given activity is quite a good indicator of the relative importance attached to that activity by society.

Attention is given to the different income levels of the staff and the effects of these on them and on the students, to the role of the Principals, the McGill Normal Committee, and other authorities, to staff relations among themselves and with the principals, and to the students of the school and their various activities most important of which were their courses of study. Reflection on these aspects of the McGill Normal School, gives a fairly clear picture of the type of student as well as the students' perceptions of their own expectations.

The hypothesis is that elementary education, and hence education as a whole, was regarded as something that had to be developed with some reluctance and extreme caution. First, there are indications that the McGill Normal School, essential to the educational needs of Protestant Quebec at the time, was nevertheless formed and maintained at the lowest possible cost. Second, it provided training for rather poorly qualified students; who, third, came from poor families. Fourth, these observations, if accurate, indicate a low priority given to elementary education; and hence, fifth to education as a whole; and, finally, sixth, such dicrimination as was evident in the McGill Normal School, was above all, a class distinction, based on financial status.

RESUME

Cette thèse examine quelques aspects de l'Ecole Normale de McGill de 1857 à 1907, période après laquelle elle devint l'Ecole de McGill pour les Enseignants. La thèse cherche à interpréter le rôle de l'école en notant quelques uns des problèmes concernant sa fondation et son fonctionnement; en réfléchissant sur des points de vues exprimés par certains dirigeants du Bas Canada qui avaient des liens étroits avec l'école; en examinant les sources financières assignées à l'école pour le paiement des employés, le maintien des bâtiments et ses annexes, et finalement pour les besoins des étudiants, parce que l'argent que l'on consacre à une certaine activité indique assez bien l'importance relative que la société y attache.

Les niveaux des salaires des employés y sont aussi étudiés, ainsi que leurs effets sur les employés et les étudiants. L'étude se penche également sur le rôle des principaux, du Comité Normal de McGill, et d'autres autorités; sur les relations des employés et des professeurs entre eux et vis-à-vis des principaux; et sur les étudiants de l'école et leurs activités dont les plus importantes étaient les cours d'études. Ces réflexions sur l'histoire de l'Ecole Normale de McGill, donnent un tableau assez clair du genre d'étudiant qui fréquentait cet établissement, de ce qu'on attendait de lui, ainsi que de ses propres aspirations.

L'hypothèse est que l'éducation élémentaire et ainsi l'éducation en général, était vue comme une expérience à développer lentement et avec une attention extrême. D'abord, il y a des indications que l'Ecole Normale de McGill, essentielle pour les besoins éducatifs du Québec Protestant du temps, avait été neanmoins créée et financée aux coûts les plus bas. Deuxièmement, les étudiants commençaient à un niveau assez bas, et, troisièmement, ils venaient de familles pauvres. Ainsi, et quatrièmement, ces observations, si elles sont justifiées, montrent l'importance relative accordée à l'éducation élémentaire, et cinquièmement, à l'éducation en général, et finalement, cette étude essaie de montrer que s'il y avait une discrimination quelconque à l'Ecole Normale de McGill, elle était surtout basée sur une distinction de classe, fonction du statut financier.

THE McGILL NORMAL SCHOOL — A BRIEF HISTORY. 1857-1907

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The McGill Normal School lasted fifty years, from 1857 to 1907. With the two Roman Catholic Normal Schools, Jacques Cartier in Montreal, and Laval in Quebec City, it was the first of the confessional normal schools in the Province of Quebec, and it was destined to expand and prosper, and eventually to become merged into the school for Teachers at Macdonald College. There are many tributes to its success, among them, the fact that 2,989 teachers were trained there.[1]

The normal schools were started in order to promote teaching in the elementary schools, as there were not enough teachers and also as there were insufficient standards by which to judge their suitability. The normal schools were designed to train teachers so that accepted standards might be reached and the whole country might, if possible, benefit from equal excellence. One of the conditions of entrance into the McGill Normal School was an undertaking to teach for at least three years after graduating.

This thesis attempts to throw light on the role of the McGill Normal School in the Province of Quebec, especially in the English-speaking Protestant section. Some aspects

---

[1] George Parmelee, "English Education," Canada and Its Provinces, Vol. XVI Province of Quebec, ed. by Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty, Toronto and Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1914, p. 486.

of the work at the Normal School are discussed and there is an attempt to interpret events and attitudes, so as to assess the activity of the School in the context of the aims and aspirations of the society which it served. The latter can be judged from expressed opinions, from the amount of money allotted to the institution and the way it was distributed, from the people chosen to direct the institution, from those chosen to benefit from it, and from what was expected of them, and from the nature of the benefits conferred on them.

There is little published material on the McGill Normal School. There are articles in magazines such as John Calam's in The Teachers' Magazine, and John Irwin Cooper's and D.C. Monroe's in The Educational Record of the Province of Quebec. There are also references to the Normal School in the Montreal Gazette, and in the M.A. theses of Orrin B. Rexford, Teacher Training in the Province of Quebec, and Keith D. Hunte, The Development of the System of Education in Canada East 1841-1867. A Historical Survey. Several references to the McGill Normal School are made by Dr. Margaret Gillett in We Walked Very Warily. A History of Women at McGill, published in 1981. More general information concerning normal schools in the Province of Quebec is found in histories of education such as George Parmelee's section on English Education in Volume XVI Canada and Its Provinces; in the histories of Louis-Philippe

Audet; in John Adams, The Protestant School System in the Province of Quebec; and more especially in the writings of Jean-Baptiste Meilleur and J.W. Dawson.

In order to relate the activities of the Normal School to the social patterns of Quebec and Canadian society, and to gain some insight into the role of the McGill Normal School in this society, more general studies on the role of education were examined, such as the section on Canadian Society: Trends and Perspectives by Frank G.Vallee and Donald Whyte, from Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives, and Brian Simons, The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870.

Above all, however, information concerning the McGill Normal School is contained in the various McGill Archives, and to a lesser extent in the Journal of Education (Quebec). The former include the Minute Books of the Normal Committee Meetings, the Corporation Minute Books, the Letter Books, the Prospectuses, copies of various regulations, reports, enrollments, pay lists, cash books, and bye-laws.

In Chapter I the relationship between the McGill Normal School and the society of which it was a part is studied. In the remaining chapters discussion centres on the activities of the principals, staff, and students. These, in addition to revealing the nature of the School, also show its structure and the kind of financial problems which it faced, and thus help in assessing its role.

This thesis attempts to show that education ranked low on the scale of social priorities. It might be contended that this is to state the obvious and yet it can be argued that every facet of attitudes towards education is worth examining since it is likely to throw light not only on the particular institution that is studied but also on the society of which it is a part. The founding and operation of an educational institution, especially one that tends toward higher learning, might be regarded as a sign of progress and advance, but whether this is so, will depend on the nature and character of that institution.

If the activities of such an institution are limited to the point where the students are provided with a curriculum which forces them to cram somewhat heterogeneous material rather than to study an area of knowledge which is more structured to lead by degrees to more knowledge and which enhances their ability to think, and if further, the institution gives students scant opportunity to develop their abilities and talents through extra curricular activities, the conclusion may be drawn that in spite of appearances, there is little real will, or at any rate insufficient will, to further the cause of education. Such a conclusion is even more justified if it becomes apparent that the beneficiaries of the educational institution are expected or rather compelled to follow set patterns of conduct and thought which in this case lead only to rather humble and ill-paid careers. Patterns of conduct and

of thought, moreover, tend to be the result of a totality of experiences including in the case of the McGill Normal School, not only the nature of the studies and of the extra-curricular activities, but also the financial and other resources of the school and the effect of these on the teachers and staff with whom the Normal School students were in contact.

The hypothesis is that the McGill Normal School was an essential element in developing a system of education which tended to be a tool to make possible the maximum use of the human resources of a particular society while not disturbing existing social, economic and religious structures. The McGill Normal School had all the signs of being an educational institution formed and maintained at the least possible cost, to provide training for rather poorly qualified students drawn almost entirely from the poorer families, who were then to become elementary school teachers. This seems to indicate that elementary education, and hence education as a whole, was regarded as something that should be developed with some reluctance and extreme caution.

The lack of financial resources is seen as the most important demonstration of this hypothesis for it affected every other aspect of the educational process here discussed. It affected the choice of students, their opportunities, their academic curriculum, and their general activities. It also affected the attitudes of principals, staff relationships, and the school buildings themselves. The hypothesis

may be considered as demonstrated if it can be shown that the student curriculum had serious shortcomings, that student activities were severely limited, that the principals and staff were overly worried by financial insecurities, and that the buildings were inadequately maintained.

The McGill Normal School, although founded to promote elementary education, seemed to function as though there were a fear, most overtly expressed at the inauguration ceremonies in March, 1857, that education for the population as a whole was a somewhat risky proposition, whose benefits were uncertain and even doubtful, and which had to be guided very cautiously and under strict control. Introducing mass education was a move in a direction which could well have had unpredictable results. This attitude remained essentially unchanged throughout the history of the McGill Normal School. Such discrimination as the School revealed, was essentially a class distinction based on financial status.

The events of the fifty years of the McGill Normal School are discussed both chronologically and thematically. In Chapter I, some aspects of the early years are analysed, with emphasis on how the role of the Normal School was seen. In Chapter II there is chronological progression, which is absent in Chapters IV and V, but throughout, the thesis seeks to focus on those elements which explain the functioning of the Normal School in relation to the perceived goals of the society of the time.

CHAPTER I

THE FOUNDING AND EARLY YEARS OF THE McGILL NORMAL SCHOOL

A. PROBLEMS

1. Social

In 1857, at the time of the inauguration of the McGill Normal School, the most fundamental deterrent to the start of the school was perhaps the social one which concerned the importance given to education by the society in which the school was founded. The issue of whether education was to be substantially supported by society is not one which the school faced consciously but one that surrounded its whole being, permeated its entire atmosphere, and remained unresolved. Education in Canada did not enjoy a high priority in the scale of social values and it was in a rather harsh and hostile atmosphere that the Normal School began. The University which controlled it and which gave it its name, was itself still struggling for survival, and the commercial society in which both the University and its affiliated Normal School, found themselves, was very undecided as to their value or role. As events turned out both the University and the Normal School did in fact enjoy steady improvement both in status and in prosperity, but this has probably been due to many factors besides local foresight and good will.

The problems of financing the public schools on whose progress and welfare the Normal School depended, were still being debated, and indeed the necessity even of the existence of public schools had only just been decided. During the 1840's and early 1850's controversy over payments of taxes had been fierce and even in 1855, Adelard Derosiers reported seven municipalities as still refractory, that is as refusing to pay their taxes.[1]

The low priority given to education was both a cause for the existence of the McGill Normal School and resulted in giving it certain characteristics. For it was the absence of interest in a system of education which created such a dearth of teachers that imposed the start of the normal school by 1857, and it was a result of this scale of priorities that for many years left the McGill Normal School with the characteristics that go with scant financial resources. The student-teachers, for the most part, came from low-income families and were subjected to a rather restrictive educational experience in somewhat harsh living conditions as indicated in more detail in Chapter II. The Sicotte Commission in 1851,[2] reported that only 503 school commissioners out of 1,025 could read and write, 190 teachers were nineteen years of age or less, and only 412 teachers out of 1991 were qualified. These

---

[1] Louis Philippe Audet, Histoire du Conseil de l'Instruction Publique de la Province de Québec, 1856-1964, Montreal: Editions Leméac, 1964, p. 8.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

ratios show that the standards of education were low, but they become even lower when we consider the low absolute numbers of teachers and when we bear in mind, further, the level of qualification which was considered acceptable.

Several references are made in this thesis to the scale of values which resulted in little money being given to the McGill Normal School. This is the clearest outward manifestation of the real scale of values in our commercial society. But values can also be assessed from statements, attitudes, and practices.

At the inauguration ceremonies of the McGill Normal School, on March 3, 1857, several statements were made which reveal clearly that those in authority were diffident about the results of expanding the numbers of people who would be educated. Pierre-Joseph Olivier Chauveau, the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Lower Canada, towards the end of his opening speech adjured mothers to watch carefully, "in case evil is spread by the teachers instead of good".[3] This warning reveals a deep respect for the powers that education was believed capable of unleashing and a deep fear lest society should be unable to control them, which in part explain why the spread of education was not encouraged to a greater extent.

---

[3] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. I, No. 3, March 1857, p. 42.

The warning, in another sense, shows a lack of respect for teachers, for it is addressed to "mothers", and one may ask by what standards "mothers" were supposed to judge what was "evil", except by the very simple criterion of accusing any teaching of being "evil", if there was criticism of accepted values. Furthermore, the teachers of the Normal School, and their pupils, were already so tightly controlled by the established political hierarchy of the country, that it is hard to find the tiniest unprotected crack. The warning issued by Chauveau could only act as a general plastering over a wall whose every crack had already been sealed off, by spreading a vague unease and suspicion of anything new that might by accident be uttered by some teacher. It made assurance doubly sure.

Bishop Fulford, the Lord Bishop of Montreal, who spoke next, expressed himself as sceptical of the "blessings of increased education".[4] He pointed out that education does not necessarily cure the evil nature of man, and that it does even enable the evil man to be more effectively bad.

His Excellency, General Eyre, also spoke and gave credit to the "liberal government"[5] of the Province, adding that the support of the people was certain to be given to such a government. By connecting the liberality of the government

---

[4] Ibid., p. 42.

[5] Ibid., p. 42.

to the support of the people, General Ayre was assigning a somewhat dependent role to education, making it appear as a privilege to be extended or withdrawn according to behaviour. Furthermore by focusing on the liberality of the Government, General Ayre was exaggerating the quality of goodness in that authority, which by to-day's standards, and even by many ancient standards, was hardly "liberal."

Professor Hicks too, in part of his address referred to teaching as being hitherto left almost entirely to the "ruined tradesman" or the "disappointed clerk" who, having failed in other pursuits, at last, and as a temporary measure, "resolves to try teaching till something better turns up."[6]

Traditionally in the Province of Quebec, and elsewhere, education had been relegated to the religious authorities, who always regarded it, at best, as a secondary responsibility and allowed it very limited development. Even the Roman Catholic Church, the most powerful of the Churches in Quebec, was never able to give elementary education to more than a small fraction of the population. Without regular and substantial subsidies, the effectiveness of the Church's effort was "severely limited,"[7] and when in 1839, Monsignor Lartigue, the coadjutor in Montreal, urged the clergy to turn to education, it was to be "after" their concern for the "maintenance

---

[6] Ibid., p. 42.

[7] Keith D. Hunte, The Development of the System of Education in Canada East, 1841-1867: A Historical Survey, M.A. Thesis, McGill University, April 1962, p. 36.

of the Church."[8] The Roman Catholic Church places priority on the maintenance of the Church, so that however great the resources, this cannot change, and it seems as though education can be furthered only when subsidies are granted, from an outside source, for the specific purpose of education.

Protestant care for education was equally limited by that Church's priorities and was further weakened by fragmentation, with numerous religious sects concerning themselves with small scattered sections of the population, and riddled with fear of the effects of education. Mark Willoughby of the British and North American Society for Educating the Poor, in 1839, reported[9] persons engaged in teaching, who were "inferior in character," and even, "highly dangerous to the principles of the pupils and inimical to the institutions of the country." If we assume that Mark Willoughby accurately reflected the priorities of his Church, then it can be seen that the highest importance was attached to guarding the population against any criticism of established Church values. It is because of possible disagreement by the teacher with some aspect of the "institutions" that he becomes "dangerous to the principles of the pupils", and hence is "inferior in character." The danger, moreover, in this case, is limited to comparisons between the Republicanism of the United States and the Monarchy of Great

---

[8] Ibid., p. 36.

[9] Ibid., p. 41.

Britain,[10] whose differences are relatively mild, but they are enough to draw the strongest condemnation. A society, or a nation, further, which declares a need to "educate the poor" in contradistinction to some other education for those who are not poor, reveals serious discriminatory attitudes in its methods of propagating education.

In 1857, the ruling groups of Lower Canada as certain statements in the inaugural speeches reveal, appear to have had doubts about the benefits of education for the population as a whole. Hence they did not believe that the spread of education was important and that it deserved a high priority in the apportioning of economic resources and opportunities. The McGill Normal School felt the consequences of this situation, and consciously or unconsciously, was fighting for greater recognition, against somewhat hostile forces.

---

[10] Ibid., p. 42.

2. Economic

The relatively low position of education, and consequently of the McGill Normal School, in the hierarchy of social values in Lower Canada, is nowhere better seen than in the economics of that School. By its charter,[11] the Normal School came under the immediate direction of the Corporation of the University of McGill, in co-operation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and a Standing Committee, known as the Normal School Committee was later appointed yearly for its administration. The Normal School Committee had five members, four from the University and the community in general, and one, the Principal, from the Normal School, and met once a month during the school sessions. By the Act of 6/10/56, (19 Vict. C 54), £ 4000 (four thousand pounds) were set aside as a grant from the Government for the Normal Schools, of which £ 1300 (one thousand, three hundred pounds) went to the McGill Normal School.[12] This sum was intended to cover all expenses except major repairs. To this sum may be added the receipts from the Model School fees which were, however, paid back almost entirely to the Superintendent of Education, except in the first five years of the School, from 1857 to 1862. During these years the annual fees totalled from $867.35 in 1857 to $2,273.79 in 1862.[13]

---

[11] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1857, p. 27, quoting from 6/10/56 Act for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, Art. I, No. 1 and No. 3.

[12] Ibid., p. 27. Art II, No. 6 and No. 7.

[13] McGill University Archives, Statement of Gross Receipts and Expenditures of the McGill Normal School, 1857 to 1879.

The minutes of the Normal School Committee meetings show that financial problems were serious and continual, taking up more time than any other subject. The difficulties manifested themselves mainly in two ways. First, in the salary structure of the teachers, and second in the laborious way money was extracted from the authorities for every repair on the Normal and Model School properties.[14] The first concerns the generally low level of teachers' salaries as indicated in more detail in Chapter III, but within this low level there was a relatively wide gap between the salaries of the Principals and a few favoured teachers compared with those of the rest of the staff. This led to frequent complaints concerning salaries but they were rarely if ever satisfactorily answered, since there were no efficient means that the teachers could use, so that even when upward revisions were made in the salary scales, the gap was widened further because of the much greater increase in the higher salaries. Also, in spite of the upward revisions, the salaries still remained low relatively to the general resources of the country. The second concerns the requests for funds for repairs which were submitted by the Secretary of the Normal Committee, on behalf of the Committee, to the Superintendent of Education, and by him usually to one of the Departments

---

[14] McGill University Archives, Accession Number 145, Minutes of the Meetings of the McGill Normal Committee, 1857 to 1907.

of the Board of Works, which eventually paid the Normal School authorities who in turn paid the contractor or worker who had done the job. These bureaucratic procedures provided a dead-weight which by slowing down all motion were a deterrent to spending and added to whatever instinct for economy the various human agents in the transaction already possessed. Every item of expenditure came under the close scrutiny of the Normal Committee and great importance was attached to minimising costs. In their exercise of this function there was a distinctly similar approach between the attitudes of the members of the Normal Committee and the attitudes of other authorities. It was the Normal Committee which had to judge in the first place whether repairs and additions were needed and then to guide the requests for funds through to a successful conclusion. The members of this Committee were as conscientious about minimising costs and as parsimonious in their estimates as anyone could wish. The great importance attached to the careful handling of money can be seen from the long deliberations concerning every prospective outlay, and from the slowness of payments for work done.

The need for increased accommodation at the Normal School, for example, was recognized at the Committee meeting of October 4, 1871. By April 3, 1872, it was decided that an East and a West wing should be added, and a contractor, Mr. Hutchison's, estimate of the cost of these was $14,635.34.

An early suggestion had been that the cost of additions to the building might be defrayed from the proceeds of the sale of the Jacques Cartier Normal School building and the Government property around. This was mentioned at the meeting on January 10, 1872, and it was further suggested that the Normal School additions should be part of a more general expansion programme which would include extensions to Laval School. A year later, on the twelfth of March, 1873, since no further steps had been taken concerning the two wings, roof repairs to the hall and repairs to the Preparatory School necessitated further estimates which it was considered might be included in a more extended series of works than those that the additional wings alone, would entail. At a meeting on June 20, 1873, the Committee decided to address an urgent plea to the Ministry of Public Instruction to request an increase in the Government grant by $5,000.00 per year, part of which would cover costs of repairs. On December 10, of the same year, a letter was read from Mr. Ouimet, the Superintendent of Education, who commented favourably on the proposed increase in grants, and also referred to a suggestion that part of the proceeds from the sale of the old Government House be used for the enlargement of the Normal School.

On June 3, 1874, at the Committee meeting, mention was again made of the money from the sale of the Jacques Cartier Normal School building which would help pay for improvements in the McGill Normal School. The problem of the drains to

the outhouses was brought up on January 6, 1875, and became intertwined with that of the building of the east and west wing additions. A first estimate by Mr. John Clifford, another contractor, was presented on June 2. This was accepted on September 1, 1875, and preliminary work was carried out. By November3, Senator James Ferrier and Dr. Dawson, both members of the McGill Normal School Committee reported that they had been informed in Quebec that $15,333.33, representing one third of a sum of money that had become available for construction, was apportioned for the McGill Normal School. By August 3, 1876, the lowest of the public tenders had been accepted and Messrs. McKenna and Sheridan were appointed as contractors. By November 1, 1876, the west wing framework was completed and by December 6, the east wing framework was ready. But the buildings were not ready for occupancy until late in 1877, the heating system was not ready till the end of 1878, and the drains were not completed till the end of 1879.

In this case, delays were caused, not by the builders, who indeed acted quickly, but by deliberations concerning funds, and such deliberations are typical of those that preceded even minor repairs.

The careful handling of money can be seen also in the slowness of payment for work done. In 1870, for example, at the meeting of November2, there was still no news on refunds from the Board of Works for repairs amounting to $257.88 done in the summer. By December 7, 1870, the Board

agreed to pay and requested the accounts, so that payment was not made until early in 1871. Again, in 1871, the Minister of Public Instruction required on October 4, vouchers as well as statements for work done in summer, and requested that bills of repairs be sent to the Board of Works. On November 1, bills were requested in duplicate, and payment was delayed.

There are numerous other examples of such delays, many of them affecting even daily routine. In 1872 on November 11, application was made to the Superintendent for sums paid in the summer for desks, chairs, and the printing of diplomas and paysheets. On December 4, 1872, a letter was sent requesting $399.40 for these items, but payment was not made until 1873. On November 5, 1873, the money required for work done in the summer, had not been sent, and at the meeting of the Normal School Committee, the Secretary asked permission to make advances from the school fees which would be deducted from the amounts sent to the Government. The Committee advised waiting. However, on December 10, a letter was read from Dr. Moreau of the Board of Works, stating that his department would be unable to pay the contractors. The Chairman then advised a temporary advance to the contractors from the Normal School savings account from the Model School fees. The Committee sanctioned this action and Ferrier was asked to present the problem at Quebec. By January 14, 1874, two of the contractors, Messrs. Deblais and Alexander, had received payment from the Board of Works, but Robert Staveley had not yet been paid, and a letter was sent to the department about this.

Some of the delays appear over sums trifling enough to appear embarassing, and led to actions which must have seriously inconvenienced the recipients. On November 3, 1875, Robert Staveley presented an estimate for $167.00 to make double windows. This was approved and the windows were set up by December 8. Yet by March 8, 1876, Robett Staveley's account for repairs, still unpaid, was sent to the Government. By May 3, 1876, E. Moreau, secretary to the Department of Public Works returned the bill, stating that such bills were not chargeable to that Department and that the Board had to approve all repairs. A letter from S. Lesage, Assistant Commissioner of Public Works, confirmed this. In order to avoid some of the bureaucratic delays, on June 26, 1877, the Committee requested James Ferrier and Dawson to apply to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction to permit payment of part of the expenses of the upkeep of the buildings from the Model School fees instead of from the grants to the Normal School.

Thus there was a constant struggle between the economic requirements of the McGill Normal School and their satisfaction. Requirements, it should be noted, already reduced to bare minima by the status of the School, and defined on a day-to-day basis by representatives of that same authority that paid the bills. The members of the McGill Normal Committee were honest, hard-working, conscientious, and responsible citizens. Nevertheless, they did represent the interests and views of the authorities, and reflected the accepted scale of values.

3. Religious

When the McGill Normal School began its operations in 1857, the decision had already been taken, through the efforts of Jean-Baptiste Meilleur and others,[15] to separate Roman Catholic from Protestant Normal Schools. Nevertheless, since the School was in a predominantly Roman Catholic Province, one in which almost the entire government personnel was also French-speaking, there were fears that a normal school organized for the Protestant minority, would not receive just consideration, and there were, in addition, uncertainties as to the role such a school might be expected to play. In his address at the inaugural ceremonies on March 3, 1857, Bishop Fulford expressed the hope that the Church of England and other religious communions would continue to receive, "fair and liberal treatment"[16] as compared with the Church of Rome. The latter had the additional advantage that besides the annual Parliamentary grants by Act of Government, it also received very large endowments, one special object of which was the education of the people. Another advantage of the Roman Church was that Roman Catholic schools were left under its undivided charge while the Protestant schools associated

---

[15] Keith D. Hunte, op. cit., p. 155.

[16] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 3, March 1857, p. 43.

together "at some possible risk and disadvantage, some necessary compromise."[17] Therefore, in the distribution of annual parliamentary grants, Bishop Fulford argued, if any favour was shown, it should be for the side of the minority.

In the event, throughout the history of the McGill Normal School, relations with the Roman Catholic authorities remained harmonious and there was mutual respect. This may be partly explained by a balance of power that did exist in spite of the disadvantages of the Protestant minority which Bishop Fulford mentioned. Although Lower Canada was predominantly Roman Catholic and French, the paramount power in Canada was Protestant and English-speaking, and thus the governing circles in Quebec were acting under a paramount power and so were considerate of the minority.

There were, however, two other interconnected areas where religion was a real and continuing problem. The first concerned the place of religion in education. The second, the nature and extent of the compromises that the various Protestant sects were obliged to make. With regard to the first, the Protestants of Lower Canada in 1857, were clearly determined to give education a Christian but not a Roman Catholic character. In the words of Bishop Fulford at the inaugural ceremonies, the Normal School was to be conducted with, "due regard to the interests of religion and morality"[18]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 43.

[18] Ibid., p. 42.

and he advised every religious group to resist efforts by any one group to control education. With regard to the second, the success of the compromise by which the various Protestant groups were planning to work together depended on their ability to find common ground or an area of common belief, and this was a kind of lowest common denominator of the acceptability of religious credos. Bishop Fulford at the inaugural ceremonies made several references to "religion" and the "fear of God", and the nearest he came to mentioning Christianity was when he suggested a "knowledge of the Gospel." It was one thing to aim at preserving the Christian character of education, and another to put these aims into practice, for the very act of defining a belief, acceptable to all, tended to modify that belief. What was actually practised depended a great deal on personalities and on predominant modes. The code of conduct expected of the student-teachers of the Normal School was Puritan in its strictness, but this did not necessarily make it Christian. Article XVI of the By-laws signed in 1856 by Pierre-Joseph Chauveau required the applicant to produce a certificate of good moral character signed by the curate or minister, but a certificate testifying to "good moral character," is not the same as a testimonial regarding a religious belief. The Christianity of the Protestants in education was much broader and more tolerant than many Protestant sects desired, and more liberal than the Christianity enforced by the different sects themselves when

schools were under their immediate influence. Bishop Fulford emphasized the need for mutual forbearance and for the absence of proselytizing.

If the Bishop himself was so moderate in the claims he made for the role of religion in the Normal School, two of the three men who later became, in turn, Principals of the Normal School, made even more modest claims. Their references to religion were pantheistic in their generality. Professor Hicks spoke of the "beneficial arrangements of the Almighty"[19] by which he claimed God is able to raise people to do a particular job, when that job was to the benefit of mankind. In this case, he meant that God would bring forward those capable of benefitting from the training of the Normal School, since teachers trained in this way, were to be of benefit to Lower Canada. People with the right qualifications, he claimed, are to be found, if society were to look for them. Professor Robins spoke of "moral excellence," the "religious element," and the "everlasting memory"[20] where the details of the devoted life would be recorded.

Thus, although it was generally accepted that religion was not to be excluded from education, in fact religion was defined in such broad terms that it came more and more to be something confined to private lives. As far as the Normal School was concerned, religion was taught as a subject and pupil-teachers were expected to attend their own places of worship.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 43.

[20] Ibid., p. 44.

B. PRELIMINARIES AND EARLY YEARS

1. Preliminaries to the Opening

The second Act of 1856 (19 Vict. c. 54), Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, created the McGill Normal School and two French Roman Catholic Normal Schools, Jacques Cartier in Montreal and Laval in Quebec city. It also raised the permanent funds for higher education from $25,000 to $88,000.[1] The McGill Normal School was co-educational and the two latter, while originally designed to be co-educational, in fact enrolled men only while older religious schools, the Sisters of the Congregation in Montreal and the Ursuline convents in Quebec and Three Rivers, trained the Roman Catholic women teachers. This was the second time that Government-sponsored Normal Schools were tried in Lower Canada, the first time being from 1836 to 1843, when the Montreal Normal School, an interdemoninational school was functioning. One important difference between the schools of the two periods was that the later Normal Schools were separate in religion.

The possibilities of promoting the establishment of normal schools were energetically pursued both by Jean-Baptiste Meilleur and by Pierre-Joseph Olivier Chauveau, as

---

[1] George Parmelee, Op. Cit., p. 429.

well as by a few other educators. Jean-Baptiste Meilleur had indeed bought the old High School of Montreal building in 1852,[2] as a home for a Protestant Normal School under the auspices of McGill University, and his influence had been strong in the formulation of the 50th clause of the Act of 1846 (9 Vic. c 27), which was amended in 1849, integrated into the Act of 1851, and formed the basis of the special law on normal schools in the Act of 1856. This clause determined the principles of primary education, the classification of teachers, and the conditions of their entry into teaching.[3]

In the Superintendent's Report of 1846,[4] Meilleur recommended the establishment of normal schools in two distinct and separate branches, one Protestant and one Roman Catholic. He there expressed himself as being convinced that in a few years teaching would be made what it ought to be, a distinct profession, "influential, respected, honourable as useful."[5]

The Education Act of 1851 provided for one Normal School, with a provision that the Government could from time to time review the rules and regulations necessary for the management of such a school. This may be construed as an opening for a possible division along lines of religion. The Act, however,

---

[2] Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, Mémorial de l'Education du Bas-Canada, Quebec; Des Presses à Vapeur de Léger Brousseau, 1876, p. 272.

[3] Ibid., p. 275.

[4] Orrin B. Rexford, Teacher Training in the Province of Quebec. A Historical Study to 1857, M.A. Thesis, McGill University, August 1936, p. 77.

[5] Ibid., p. 77.

was never implemented as a result of strong opposition. The Act also adopted the general principle of dividing school appropriations on a population basis and proposed to apply this principle to the Normal School grants. In that case, the Protestant Normal School, would have received two twelfths of the sums of money designated for Normal Schools. Chauveau recognized that this would mean that the Protestant Normal School would become inferior and he recommended an equal division.[6] In 1853, Jean-Baptiste Meilleur repeated the suggestion of the necessity for establishing a normal school,[7] claiming that the teachers, male and female, were deficient in good methods for conveying knowledge rather than in the knowledge itself. The normal school would provide for an otherwise unobtainable uniformity.[8] The Sicotte Commission also recommended the immediate opening of normal schools in Montreal and Quebec as the first and most indispensable act.[9]

In his report in 1855, Chauveau stated that the normal schools had been successful in Upper Canada and other provinces and in the United States. He argued in favour of state supervision of the normal schools rather than the

---

[6]George Parmelee, Op. Cit., p. 486.

[7]Orrin B. Rexford, Op. Cit., p. 77.

[8]Ibid., p. 77.

[9]Louis-Philippe Audet, Op. Cit., p. 22.

management of volunteer societies, and for separate normal schools for the Protestants and Roman Catholics of Quebec.[10] The difficulties inherent in reconciling the Christian religion and the rights of conscience were recognized and Chauveau recommended that normal schools be under the active and incessant superintendence of the Department and organized to give the principal section of the population, heterogeneous in language and religion, guarantees that the individual would be able to attend that institution which most suited his views.[11] He further recommended that the Normal Schools be set up in urban not rural areas, and that the Legislature leave lattitude to the government whose actions hitherto had been too precisely legislated.

The Second Act of 1856 (19 Vict. c. 54) did indeed avoid the precise previous legislation, leaving the details of organization in the hands of the Superintendent with the approval of the Governor in Council.[12] The Superintendent was to associate with himself the Corporation of the University of McGill College. The original idea had been for the McGill Normal School to be independent of McGill College[13] but in fact the University did obtain control and the Principal of McGill University became the Principal of the Normal School.

---

[10] Orrin B. Rexford, op. cit., p. 78.

[11] Ibid., p. 78.

[12] Ibid., p. 81.

[13] Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, op. cit., p. 274.

Chapter II of the Act, Article 5, gave the Superintendent the right to keep a book of accounts for money spent on each of the Normal Schools. Article 6 apportioned a total of £ 4,000.00 (four thousand pounds) to be divided among the Normal Schools,[14] and the first Act of 1856 (19 Vict. c. 14), instituted the Journal of Education on the recommendation of the Louis-Victor Sicotte Commission.[15]

Parallel to these events, were the activities of the Colonial Church and School Society which in the early 1850's[16] decided to train its own English-speaking teachers and in 1853 sent a properly qualified master to commence a model school under the direction of a committee formed for that purpose. The Committee was to establish in Montreal, a Normal and a Model School under a well trained master from England, to be used to train masters for their own schools.[17] William Henry Hicks, formerly of Bower School in Clapham, England, arrived in Montreal in September 1853. In October 1853, the Montreal Normal School of the Colonial Church and School Society opened with eleven scholars in St. George's Church on St. Joseph Street. By Christmas this number had risen to

---

[14] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1857, p. 27.

[15] Louis-Philippe Audet, "Education in Canada East and Quebec 1840-1875," Canadian Education: A History, ed. by Donald J. Wilson, Robert M. Stamp, Louis-Philippe Audet, Scarborough, Ont: Prentice Hall of Canada Ltd., 1970, p. 178.

[16] Orrin B. Rexford, op. cit., p. 89.

[17] Ibid., p. 89.

60, and new quarters were obtained on Bonaventure Street, the old name for the extension of Craig Street, at the corner of Victoria Square.[18] The new Model School was opened by the Lord Bishop of Montreal, the Right Reverend Francis Fulford, in May 1854. By June there were 150-180 pupils at the Model School.[19] Hicks was determined to avoid monitors if sufficient teachers-in-training presented themselves, and by 1855 there were sixteen. This number increased to 22 in the following year, and the school obtained Government grants for two successive years, of £500 (five hundred pounds) for each year. Hicks himself, was later reported in the Journal of Education as being trained in England in some of the best institutions and as having already made a reputation in Lower Canada for training good teachers.[20]

William Dawson, who was appointed Principal of McGill University, from Nova Scotia, in 1854, was anxious to give effect[21] to a provision in the statutes of the University which made possible the creation of a Normal School department. He had close associations with Chauveau, who became

---

[18]John Irwin Cooper, "The Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers Centenary Salute." The Educational Record. Vol. 80. April to June, 1964, p. 83.

[19]Orrin B. Rexford, op. cit., p. 90.

[20]Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1857, p. 30.

[21]Orrin B. Rexford, op. cit., p. 91.

Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1855, and with Sir Edmund Head, of New Brunswick, then Governor-General, who had recommended Dawson for the principalship of McGill, and had suggested to him the establishment of a Normal School within the University as a wise and profitable move.[22] Dawson's first innovation in Montreal was to found a counterpart at McGill of the normal school he had founded in Truro, Nova Scotia. As an alternative to selling some of the valuable land on the outskirts of the city, Dawson sought Government support and Sir Edmund Head suggested he take advantage of an Act for the Establishment of Normal Schools,[23] through which Ryerson had already founded the Toronto Normal School in 1847. Chauveau co-operated with him and established similar schools for the Roman Catholics in Quebec and Montreal. The advantages to the University were additional strength to the staff and the placing of McGill in direct contact with the higher schools of the English and Protestant population of Lower Canada, thus giving greater unity and strength to that part of the education system which especially provided for their needs.[24]

---

[22]William Dawson, Fifty Years of Work in Canada. London: Ballantyne, Hanson, 1901, p. 116.

[23]Ibid., p. 116.

[24]Ibid., p. 117.

During the Christmas season of 1855, Dawson visited Toronto and discussed this project with the Governor General.[25] On his return he reported to the Board of Governors on January 11, 1856 at a meeting in the office of the Honourable George Moffatt. The plan was approved in principle. On September 27, at a meeting of the Board of Governors, Dawson urged action again with regard to the Normal School. A Committee was formed of Judge Charles Dewey Day, Senator James Ferrier, Christopher Dunkin, and Professor William Dawson to examine the building of the High School on Belmont Street, and to contact the committee of the Colonial Church and School Society[26] to unite that branch of their operations connected with the Normal School with the projected Normal School to be affiliated with McGill.[27] At the October meeting, the sub-committee reported progress, one of the problems being to find staff, and shortly after, there was agreement with the Bishop of Montreal, Francis Fulford, and the University, that the School should become the operative section of the McGill Normal School.[28]

On October 29, it was agreed that William Dawson was to be Principal of the new Normal School with Sampson Paul Robins,

---

[25] Ibid., p. 117.

[26] Orrin B. Rexford, op. cit., p. 83.

[27] Ibid., p. 92.

[28] Ibid., p. 92.

Principal of Brantford Institute, as Professor in the Normal School on the recommendation of Dr. Ryerson.[29] The basis of negotiations with the Committee of the Colonial Church and School Society was adopted and sent to the Superintendent for approval.

The McGill Normal School would give to the teachers-in-training in the school of the Colonial Church and School Society, all the advantages of pupils under their regulations. William Henry Hicks was to be a Normal School Professor with a salary of £ 300 (three hundred pounds) plus allowances. The Principal of the University and the Professors of the McGill Normal School were to prepare the bye-laws for secular and religious instruction and for the general management of the school, for the approval of the Corporation. These bye-laws were to be approved also by the Committee of the Colonial Church and School Society in so far as they affected the school and the teachers. The Colonial Church and School Society School was to continue under William Hicks, to instruct pupil-teachers in the practice of teaching. On the above conditions the Colonial Church and School Society would transfer to the McGill Normal School that branch of their work which related to the training of teachers.[30]

---

[29] John Irwin Cooper, Op. Cit., p. 83.

[30] Orrin B. Rexford, Op. Cit., p. 93.

In this manner, William Hicks and the entire Colonial Church and School Society School were to be absorbed by McGill University. The Model School of the Colonial Church and School Society, was to become the Model School of the McGill Normal School, and the Normal School of the Society was to become part of the McGill Normal School with William Hicks as a Professor of the Normal School and in charge of the Model School. The London Commission, the Head Office of the Colonial Church and School Society in London, realizing that their essential objectives were safeguarded, had no objection, provided an arrangement was made for the continuance of religious instruction and management.[31]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 94.

2. The Inauguration

The McGill Normal School opened with great pomp and ceremony on March 3, 1857.[32] There is something disproportionate between the circumstances of the school and the glamour of the gathering of notables that came to the inaugural ceremony. The Normal School had an enrollment of seven men and forty nine women, most of them from fairly poor homes, with at best, very modest careers to look forward to. The ceremony, however, was attended by leaders from every walk - the Honourable Colonel Taché, Premier; the Honourable Mr. Cartier, Attorney General; the Honourable Mr. Lemieux, Commissioner of Public Works; members of Parliament; Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, the former Superintendent of Public Instruction; Pierre-Joseph-Olivier Chauveau, the present Superintendent; His Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Montreal, the Rev. Francis Fulford; the Reverend Dr. Leach, Canon of the Cathedral; William Dawson, Principal of McGill University; the Honourable Judge Day, President of the Board of the University; the Secretary and officers of the Department of Education; school inspectors; members of the Protestant Board of Examiners; Principal Verreau and Professors of the Jacques-Cartier Normal School; William Hicks, Samson Robins, and the Professors of the McGill Normal School; and others. Moreover many of those

---

[32] Journal of Education (Ouebec) Vol. 1, No. 3., March 1857, p. 40.

who attended the McGill ceremony had that very morning attended the opening of the Jacques-Cartier Normal School, and again there is a discrepancy between the importance attached to the inaugurations of these two schools and the rush to have both inaugurations over in one day. It is as though there was a desire to give to those events an impression of significance which they in fact lacked. It would perhaps have been better for the cause of education, but more expensive, if larger grants were given and much simpler inaugural ceremonies.

The nature of the ceremony and the various addresses given at the inauguration reveal some of the views and attitudes of the people of the time: First the acceptance of the principle of government participation in education was reaffirmed both symbolically and explicitly. Symbollically, by the presence of many government officials and by the letter from H.E. the Governor-General, Sir Edmund Head, which was read by Chauveau, in which the Governor-General excused his absence, thereby implying that he was present in spirit. Explicitly, this view is stated several times. Bishop Fulford said that no effectual progress in education could ever be made without

the "active interference and influence"[33] of government. Sampson Robins refered to Canada as being at the beginnings of nationhood when, a "complete educational system"[34] was an imperative necessity.

Second, as concerns the McGill Normal School, there is a general acceptance of the principle that religion should not be imparted primarily within an educational system. Again we have both symbolic and explicit references. Symbolically, the acceptance of the Normal School by all the principal non-Roman Catholic clergy and the presence of their representatives at the inaugural ceremonies showed a loyalty to a patriotism beyond religious limitations, and the presence of so many Roman Catholic dignitaries also showed good-will on their part to this patriotism. Explicitly, there were several broad references to God the Creator, but no narrower interpretation which conformed to the views of any particular sect. Bishop Fulford indeed, stressed the need for "mutual forbearance"[35] and stated clearly that there should be no efforts "to proselytize."[36]

Third, although praise for the benefits of education was lavish, there was an undercurrent of uncertainty as to where efforts to expand educational opportunities would lead,

---

[33] Ibid., p. 42.

[34] Ibid., p. 43.

[35] Ibid., p. 43.

[36] Ibid., p. 43.

and some misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the role of the teacher. This uncertainty persisted in spite of the iron-clad controls placed over the entire educational system. Symbolically again, this is seen in the over-emphasis in the inaugural ceremonies of the importance of starting the normal schools, because, apart from anything else, as Jean-Baptiste Meilleur[37] said, they should have been opened at least twenty years earlier. The glitter of a grand opening, to some extent, hid the modest role that had in reality been assigned to the normal schools.

Fulton expressed his fears concerning the benefits of mass education openly.[38] Robins emphasized the importance of not imparting knowledge alone, in the Normal School, but also the training and strengthening of the "faculties" for the "duties of future life"[39] by which presumably he meant that the teacher should be so trained that he would have a kind of instinctive, reflex reaction to obeying the dictates of society and to acting within the canons of accepted mores, something like a soldier. Such a training would naturally dry up any desire to foster important critical attitudes. To Robins, the reward of the teacher will be to realize, or perhaps to dream, that his name and the

---

[37] Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, op. cit., p. 272.

[38] Journal of Education (Quebec) Vol. 1, No. 3, March, 1857, p. 42.

[39] Ibid., p. 44.

"remembrance" of his "devoted life",[40] will be recorded in the "everlasting memory."

It is interesting also to observe the remarks made by Hicks that the "elementary" teacher, by proper training, will be regarded as a "protagonist in the fight" against ignorance and crime.[41] But proper training, according to Robins, is precisely that which will incapacitate him as a protagonist, since it will train him not to resist established systems and ideas, which automatically will remove him from the ranks of the protagonist. To assume that there is a "fight" against ignorance and crime is also perhaps, an illusion, if by that we mean that the de facto authorities necessarily wish to eliminate ignorance and crime by expanding educational opportunities.[42] Furthermore, the observation that the elementary teacher should be this protagonist, when even the University professors have not been, is probably incorrect.[43] Our societies are harsher than such an optimistic view would concede.[44] But even if we admit a fight against

---

[40] Ibid., p. 44.

[41] Ibid., p. 44.

[42] Brian Simon, The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1974 - for a lengthy discussion of the attitudes of privileged groups to education.

[43] Frank G. Vallee, and Donald Whyte, "Canadian Society: Trends and Perspectives," pp. 556-575, Canadian Society. Sociological Perspectives, ed. by Bernard R. Blishen, Frank E. Jones, Kaspar D. Naegele, and John Porter, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1971.

[44] Brian Simon, op. cit., passim.

ignorance and crime by a small proportion of society, it is hard to see the teachers as a whole, let alone the elementary teachers, as being in the vanguard. Here again, there seems to be evidence that teachers may follow, but they are not in the vanguard of any kind of fight.[45]

Fourth, in spite of the seriousness of the educational authorities, and particularly of the principals and professors, certain statements made by them do not seem to be consistent with others or with professed aims, and leave the impression that even with then, education does not have first priority. Robins, for example, spoke of the "thoroughly efficient school" and the "thoroughly efficient teacher,"[46] both perhaps hyperbolic and even slightly denigratory in that the word "efficient" has connotations of functioning smoothly, machine-like. What is strange, however, is the means suggested, of how this may be done. There were to be lectures on "various branches of knowledge," but "not confining ourselves to what the pupil doesn't know"[47], there will be thorough reviews of the most elementary branches of a common school education. There appears to be an over emphasis on

---

[45] John S. Brubacher, A History of the Problems of Education, Second Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966, pp. 584-594.

[46] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 3, March 1857, p. 44.

[47] Ibid., p. 44.

elementary studies and such thorough reviews of the most elementary branches must be truly boring for the pupil as well as a hindrance to further knowledge. An objective of teaching the Normal School pupils again, according to Robins, was to give them "moral and mental" advantages by giving them instruction a little beyond the "mere modicum"[48] which they themselves might have to teach. This is hardly a high standard of knowledge at which to aim.

Again, the plan of the curriculum, as outlined, contained contradictions. Among the subjects, there were to be lectures on the theory of teaching connecting the "art of teaching with laws of our mental being, as far as they have been revealed to us."[49] This requires a high level of understanding and is inconsistent with what Robins had just said nor is it consistent with what followed which was that these objectives would be achieved by "constantly witnessing operations of the Model School." To connect the "art of teaching with laws of our mental being" is very difficult, demanding concentrated thought and observation, especially if it is to be "as far as they have been revealed to us" which implies keeping up with current information. Observation of other people teaching, however, must have much more limited value, so that time

---

[48] Ibid., p. 44.

[49] Ibid., p. 44.

spent on the less profitable must be deducted from time that could have been spent on the more profitable.

Fifth, many tributes were paid to Teachers' Associations, especially by William Hicks, who indeed was one of the founders of the Protestant Teachers' Association of Lower Canada.[50] However, the concept of a Teachers' Association was very different from what it is to-day. William Hicks spoke of the Association as attempting to establish a "permanent depository of school apparatus."[51] But he believed also that such an association should concern itself with providing for libraries and with arranging for pension funds. What particularly distinguishes his attitude, however, from recent attitudes is his lack of militancy and his uncritical approach toward the authorities, which is natural to one who was so unprotected. He spoke of the "liberal" trustees[52] and in general accepted the view of a hierarchical society where those below have to act in an extremely judicious manner toward those above, in order to be able to raise their standards of living.

---

[50] John Irwin Cooper, op. cit., p. 81.

[51] Journal of Education (Quebec) Vol. 1, No. 3, March 1857, p. 45.

[52] Ibid., p. 45.

3. Early Activities

The McGill Normal School, as already stated, opened on March 3, 1857, with an enrollment of 49 women and 7 men. This preponderance of women was a characteristic of the school to the end of its time, and to some extent this indicates the assessment by prospective students of the career which it made possible. The School opened by virtue of the Acts of 1856 (19 Vict. c. 14 and 19 Vict. c. 54), but several of the principles embodied in the Acts of 1856, which guided the activities of the School, were given legislative form earlier. The Act of 1846 (9 Vict. c. 27) established [53] three grades of teacher diplomas - the Elementary, the Model, and the Academy, and set out General Regulations Numbers XI, XXVIII, and XXIX for all normal schools, with each school having its own bye-laws, within the framework of these General Regulations.

Articles 12 to 14 of the bye-laws of the McGill Normal School defined the status and functions of ordinary and associate professors, the salary of the former being set at a maximum of £ 350 (three hundred and fifty pounds), Article 13, and the latter at £ 100, (one hundred pounds), Article 14. Article 15 set out the terms of the entrance examinations which were to be given under the supervision of the principal or his delegate, and would include reading, writing, the rudiments of grammar and arithmetic. All

---

[53] Orrin B. Rexford, op. cit., p. 84.

diplomas were to be issued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Article 28. Each normal school was to have a model school, Article 30, and the teachers of the normal schools were to be nominated by the Superintendent. The normal school pupils were to teach in the model school under the direction of the teachers and under the supervision of the Principal and the ordinary professors of the Normal School.

At the close of the first session in June 1857, eleven elementary certificates were presented to female student-teachers and five to male. In June, as in March, at the inaugural celebrations, elaborate ceremonies marked the occasion, although the June ceremonies were much simpler in comparison. In the morning session, from 9 a.m. to noon, a short address was given by the Principal, William Dawson, and in the afternoon session which was attended by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Pierre-Joseph-Olivier Chauveau; the Right Reverend, the Bishop of Montreal, Bishop Francis Fulford; Professors and teachers, the class was examined in various subjects. Robins examined them in mathematics, algebra, and geometry; Hicks examined them in geography and grammar; Professor Fronteau in French; and Dawson in Zoology.[54]

It is astonishing to read of such examinations which by their range would normally require much more time both to be

---

[54] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 7, July 1857, p. 98.

given and to be assessed, and could, one would think, be given in more appropriate circumstances. It is interesting to note also that the Superintendent in his speech on this occasion stated that he "heard people laugh or at least smile"[55] at the many subjects taken by the Normal School students, so that the great range of subjects seems to have puzzled observers of that time too. It would be reasonable to assume that the word "examination" used for the questioning that took place that afternoon, referred to a kind of exhibition sampling of knowledge, like a gymnastic display or a pianoforte recital, but this cannot have been so, for the Superintendent claimed that this examination "showed"[56] that it was possible to learn all the subjects. This means that these examinations were taken as accurate indicators of what the pupils learned and the students who passed their elementary year were to proceed to the model class to receive their model diploma the following year.[57]

The Normal School building, bought in 1852 by Jean-Baptiste Meilleur,[58] used to belong to the High School of Montreal.

---

[55] Ibid., p. 99.

[56] Ibid., p. 99.

[57] Ibid., p. 99.

[58] Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, op. cit., p. 273.

It faced Belmont St.,[59] with La Gauchetière behind and St. Geneviève Street on its eastern side. It was thus at the north-eastern corner of Victoria Square to-day. The eastern wing of the building was reserved for the boys and the western wing for the girls, and in each section there were model school and normal school class rooms, with recitation galleries and libraries. Space, however, must have been limited for each of the two model school class rooms was 27' by 38', to fit all the male and female classes respectively, and the two normal school classrooms were 21' by 37' each.[60] The Normal School Committee too, often complained that the School, occupying less than two acres, did not have enough room for playgrounds, nor for expansion.[61] However, in the Prospectuses the classrooms were described as well ventilated with a plentiful supply of fresh air.[62] The Normal School library measured 16' by 28', and was also used for storing apparatus. The Model School had double desks according to the Boston plan, with accomodation for 200 children, and the Normal School had 50 desks and chairs. The building was heated by

---

[59] McGill University Archives, Accession 927/3/1 c 1857, Prospectus of the Normal School, p. 1.

[60] McGill University Archives, Accession 927/3/64

[61] D. C. Monroe, "The Education of Teachers Seventy Years Ago." The Educational Record of the Province of Quebec. Vol. LXVII, No. 1, Jan-March 1951.

[62] McGill University Archives, Accession 927/3/1 op. cit., p. 1.

three furnaces, in the basement, where the porter too, had his residence.

The McGill Normal School was the only normal school that was affiliated to a University and the Superintendent had associated with him for its management, the governing body of the University.[63] Although, as previously mentioned, this had not been Meilleur's original thought,[64] the affiliation of the Normal School with the University enabled the students to derive benefits from the University with its more ample means.

The first teachers included Dawson who taught natural history and agriculture; Robins who taught the art of teaching in the junior division, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, natural philosophy, chemistry and linear drawing; and Hicks who taught the art of teaching in the senior division, history, geography, English grammar, composition, declamation, mental and moral philosophy, reading, spelling, and writing.[65] Graduates of the McGill Normal School could go to the University free of charge, and indeed their education at the Normal School was also free with a grant of £ 8 (eight pounds) to £ 9 (nine pounds) per year for board. The students lived in private boarding

---

[63] Ibid., p. 1.

[64] Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, op. cit., p. 274.

[65] McGill University Archives. Accession 927/3/1, op. cit., p. 3.

houses selected by the Principal, if they were from outside Montreal. Students who lived over 90 miles from Montreal were given a small allowance to a maximum of £2 10/- (two pounds, ten shillings) per annum to cover travelling expenses, proportionate to the distance. This allowance was paid quarterly.

The sessions were from the fifteenth of September to the fifteenth of July,[66] with a one-week vacation for Christmas. The first year's session started on March 3, but was counted a full session.

Lodgings were not always easy to find. A note to Dawson from Mr. A.H. Vaughan of Clarenceville, P.Q., dated July 3, 1857, presents the case of three young ladies - Miss Bissel, Miss McPie, and Miss Rebec who searched all day with Mr. Vaughan but were unable to find lodging. They reported this to Dawson who suggested they call on him the following morning. When there was still no news of available lodgings, Vaughan searched himself and found accommodation at 15/- (fifteen shillings) a month but this turned out to be too expensive since the Normal School was unable to give the promised eight or nine pounds. Vaughan tried to see Dawson again on a later day when he was in Montreal but Dawson was away and Hicks advised him to leave Miss Bissel in Montreal until Dawson's return.[67]

---

[66] Ibid., p. 2.

[67] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/3/24.

The founding of the McGill Normal School was an important event in the history of education of the Province of Quebec, for it marked the beginning of an organized and sustained effort to improve the quality of teaching of an important section of the population. Nevertheless, in operation, the School showed that the founding fathers and their successors were conservative and cautious to the point where their leadership enabled the institution barely to keep abreast of current practice. These characteristics are reflected in the limited resources given to the school and the somewhat barren prospects of the students.

CHAPTER II

THE PRINCIPALS OF THE MCGILL NORMAL SCHOOL

A. WILLIAM J. DAWSON, 1857-1870

1. Personal Prestige

The first of the three principals of the McGill Normal School, William J. Dawson, was already Principal of McGill University, and continued as Principal and Vice-Chancellor of that University until 1893. He was appointed Principal of McGill University on the recommendation of Sir Edmund Head, Governor-General of Canada, whom he knew from Nova Scotia, and with whom he frequently conferred during the time he was also Principal of the McGill Normal School. Dawson was active, energetic, and innovative, looking beyond the immediate surroundings to wider horizons. He seems to have had a flair for public relations, so that he was constantly in contact with government officials of the highest rank[1] and also with leading business men, leaders in the economic life of the country, who often take an interest in the government of a country and in its educational policy. Thus Dawson was close to the fountain-head of power in the country and his influence in shaping the character of the

---

[1] William Dawson, Fifty Years of Work in Canada, London: Ballantyne, Hanson, 1901, p. 117 et passim.

Normal School, and in guiding its activities was palpable. He was well placed and well qualified to steer a course which would somewhat meet the requirements of the population at large, and at the same time not overstep any boundaries set by those in authority.

It was Sir Edmund Head who directed attention to the Act which enabled McGill University to affiliate the new, Protestant Normal School,[2] and Dawson also worked closely with Pierre-Joseph-Olivier Chauveau, the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Lower Canada, as well as with members of the Corporation of McGill University, to realize the Normal School in the form it eventually took. Thus the influence of the first Principal of the Normal School was strong in shaping the destinies of that Normal School even before it came into existence, and equally it continued long after he retired from the principalship, for William Dawson took an active interest in the school to the moment of his retirement as Vice-Chancellor of McGill in 1893, and even to the day of his death in 1898. Until he left McGill, he was on the Normal School Committee, almost continuously as its Chairman, so that his advice and opinion were of vital importance.

Above all, Dawson was the spokesman for the Normal School to the Government. The period of his principalship

---

[2] Ibid., p. 116.

was one part only of the period of his connection with the Normal School, and it is over the total period that his role can be most clearly seen. The Normal School was not an institution that attracted the rich, but in the words of Dawson, it provided an added dimension to McGill University, and in the Normal School, the University together with its sponsor-class, found an extremely pliable tool with which to direct Protestant education in Lower Canada. Dawson was an intermediary between an educational institution whose operations he understood in detail, and the leaders of the Protestant, English-speaking community of Lower Canada who were interested in shaping the development of education, especially when this development affected the new struggling University of McGill. These leaders tended to give from their own resources when these were adequately protected, but also took full advantage of public resources as administered by governments on which their influence was considerable.

Dawson made frequent trips to Quebec City, often with Senator James Ferrier, and was successful, on many occasions, in obtaining for the Normal School, grants, payments and recognitions, which would not otherwise have been gained. This is particularly evident in the negotiations for increased grants which began in 1873. This was after Dawson had retired

from the principalship of the Normal School, it is true, but he was Chairman of the McGill Normal Committee and in the arguments presented to the government were references to practices at the time when he was still Principal.

At the Committee meeting of June 25, 1873,[3] the decision was taken to request an additional $5,000. in annual government grants for salaries and for the maintenance of the building. Dawson stated at this meeting that Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, when he was Superintendent of Public Instruction had expressed his readiness to support such a request. On October 6, 1873[4] a letter was sent to the Minister of Public Instruction, formally requesting this increase. In later discussions,[5] it was stressed that the Normal School was maintained with the utmost economy, that the Committee and the Principal exerted themselves to avoid unnecessary expenses, but the annual grants were inadequate and in 1872-1873 there was a deficit of $250. This was so in spite of "too much"[6] economy, such that improvements and facilities were often denied. The conditions for salaries too, had long since changed. Dawson for several years had received no

---

[3]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. cit., June 25, 1873.

[4]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/24/42b. October 6, 1873.

[5]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/24/42c. Memoire Wants of McGill Normal School, November 18, 1873.

[6]Ibid., November 18, 1873.

remuneration as Principal, and had been paid only for his lectures on natural history and agriculture. His presentation of the request for increased annual grants contributed to its eventual fulfilling.

Apart from being uniquely placed to act as spokesman for the Normal School in its dealings with the Government, Dawson was also able, partly because of his position, to make suggestions concerning new practices in education. On February 27, 1868,[7] he wrote to P.J.O. Chauveau concerning ways to encourage and improve the quality of rural education, observing that, although female teachers could not work on model farms, they could teach the theory of agriculture. He therefore recommended the setting up of experimental gardens in which they could work. He suggested that a small outlay would make this possible, near the school, on the College grounds. Teachers trained in this way, he contended, might at least promote a taste for horticulture among pupils. In 1859 also, through the influence of Dawson, normal school bursaries were established in the Faculty of Arts of McGill University with a view to encouraging young men to devote themselves to the work of teaching in the Higher Schools and Academies.[8]

---

[7]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/17/31. February 27, 1868.

[8]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/10/24. J.W. Dawson Official papers. Memorandum 1859.

Before the retirement of Dawson as Principal of the Normal School in January, 1870, the Corporation Committee of McGill University in a report in December, 1869, recommended that a Standing Committee of the Corporation, to be known as the McGill Normal Committee, have the general supervision of the affairs of the school on behalf of the Corporation.[9] Dawson then continued as Vice-Chancellor of the University only and Hicks became Principal of the Normal School. These decisions were read to the Corporation Committee at its meeting on March 3, 1870, by Hicks. The Normal School Committee was to be made up of five members of whom the Vice-Chancellor was to be the chairman. Three members would form a quorum and the Committee was to report annually.

The Corporation Committee also recommended that the Principal of the Normal School continue to hold monthly meetings of the professors and teachers of the Normal School which the Chairman of the Normal Committee was free to attend. The Chairman was to watch over the interests of the school and to represent the Corporation, and he was to assist the principal and professors in the examinations of the School. In this way Dawson was able to maintain a very close watch

---

[9] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book of the Meetings of the Corporation Committee of the McGill Normal School, March 3, 1870.

on the activities of the Normal School. As Chairman of the Normal School Committee, he directed the deliberations there, and he had free access to all the staff meetings at the school, as well as to all the activities of the School. At the same time he was relieved of a significant portion of the day-to-day details. At first, he had not intended to be Principal of the Normal School[10] and he claimed that the duties of Principal, reduced to half his available time for original research, which he regretted in spite of his pleasure at teaching there, because of the earnestness of the classes.

Dawson was also one of the champions of Protestant education rights in Lower Canada, and he agreed with P.J.O. Chauveau and Monseigneur Turgeon, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Quebec, that educational standards had to be raised to bridge the gaps between primary, secondary and higher education. He believed that the common schools were not to be considered as if operating in an academic vacuum. He emphasized the need for an integrated system.

He was, however, championing educational rights in a local sense, fearing loss of Protestant rights compared to French Roman Catholic rights, not with a great vision or with any sort of more absolute ideal such as universal education. Thus the concept of the "raising of educational standards" does not appear to have included any appraisal of the curricula

---

[10]William J. Dawson, op. cit., p. 120.

of the McGill Normal School, nor any examination of extra-curricular education or indeed of the way of life of the Normal School students. At the meeting on December 14, 1881, he was firm in his rejection of the proposals suggested by Elson I. Rexford,[11] which did suggest changes of emphasis in the Normal School curriculum.

But mere integration within a system does not necessarily constitute progress or advance, which surely are determined rather by the nature of the curriculum, the nature of extra-curricular activity, the attractiveness of daily living, and the future prospects, of the McGill Normal School students as well as some assessment of the advantages of more universal opportunities for education.

---

[11]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. cit., December 14, 1881.

2. His Influence on the Character of the Normal School

In this section four characteristics of the McGill Normal School are mentioned in order to show the nature or character of the school. The first and second of these are almost completely independent of the will of the principal, but the third especially and even the fourth, to some extent, show the effects of his aims and methods, or at least show that these were in harmony with the aims and methods of the time.

Throughout the years of the principalship of Dawson the McGill Normal School was, first, strictly Protestant, in accordance with its charter, and also Anglo-Saxon. Student enrollment for 1857[12] shows twenty-one members of the Church of England, nine Presbyterians, and a smaller number each of Baptists, Congregationalists, Scottish Church, Methodists, and Adventists. The following year showed thirteen Presbyterians and seventeen members of the Church of England; 1858 to 1859 showed twenty-five Presbyterians and twenty-one members of the Church of England; and 1859 to 1860 showed thirty-five and eleven respectively. After this, the records fade away, but all the denominations present in the spring of 1857 were still present in the summer of 1860 with the Methodists as well as the Presbyterians in a higher proportion.

---

[12] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Enrollments, 1857 to 1868.

The second characteristic of the McGill Normal School was the overwhelming prepønderance of women. By December 4, 1872,[13] a total of 831 pupils had enrolled, of whom 105 were male and 726 female. There are numerous references to this preponderance and Dawson himself observed that co-education was possible at the Normal School because the great excess in the number of women over the number of men facilitated a strict discipline.[14] The greater number of women is also indicative of the opinions held at the time of the career that the Normal School made possible. Teaching, particularly at the elementary level, does not appear to have been attractive to men. At the same time, partly perhaps because of the smaller number applying, the men had no difficulty obtaining posts on graduating. In his additional report in 1867, to the Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction on teachers in training at the Normal School, Dawson observed that male graduates obtained positions almost immediately.[15] It is also possible that although men did not find elementary or even secondary school teaching attractive, the population at large might have preferred male teachers to female.

---

[13] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. cit., December 4, 1872.

[14] William J. Dawson, op. cit., p. 120.

[15] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/18. Report by W.J. Dawson to Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1867.

The preponderance of women students obviously had a strong influence on the character of the Normal School and this is considered in more detail in Chapter IV. Student activities were suited to women rather than men, and the men subject to rules designed primarily for women, outnumbered six or seven times by the women,[16] and above all, restricted in their social intercourse, must have felt a certain isolation and lack of fulfillment. They were hardly in a position to enjoy the supposedly male world in which they were living.

The third characteristic of the Normal School was that the students were strictly controlled, not only in the conditions of their entrance and stay at the school, but also in their private lives and in their attitudes and thoughts. In February, 1859, for example, five students were suspended as we learn from a letter from Dawson to Mr. Smith,[17] three for the whole session, including Miss Smith. We are not told what the offence was, but Dawson writes that it was "nothing more than a juvenile indiscretion", and again, "no grave moral offence." Dawson also writes that Miss Smith came in too late in the session to be able to succeed, which seems to be an irrelevant fault. But in spite of all this, the indiscretion, admittedly not serious in itself, "could become" more serious and "could" result in "serious injury to themselves and to the school". So that the students appear to be punished for an act which might have had

---

[16] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Enrollments.

[17] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/9/121A, February, 1859.

unpleasant consequences but which did not actually have them. But what is more interesting is the horror-stricken letter with thirty-one signatures, which was addressed to Professor Dawson by the junior students in connection with the above incident.[18] In this they express "horror" and "indignation" that the conduct of a few should bring so much contumely on the whole school. They claim that this incident caused remarks such as, "I like to converse with Normal School girls for they vie with me in profanity", or "I would have entered the Normal School after the Christmas vacation, could I have done so without endangering my reputation." The signatories expressed themselves as being against the re-admission of the five offenders.

The impression is that the student body or perhaps the leaders among the students, were so conditioned by their anxiety to please the school authorities, that they were more severe even than the authorities. There seems to have been a great degree of submissiveness not only to the orders but to the whims of the school authorities, and a desire to foresee what would be an accepted reaction to a situation so as to gain the maximum approval and praise. This humility and desire to please, coupled with some sanctimoniousness, the result perhaps of stern discipline, although not universal, is quite evident. It can be seen even in letters of students who had already graduated. On July 15, 1859,[19] Mary Harper writing from Thurso to Dawson asks what she should do as she had received the offer of a good teaching post in Upper

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/11/36. Dawson Papers, July 15, 1859.

Canada. She claims, somewhat posturing, to be opposed by enemies in her present school. Again, on the fifth of April, 1870, Ellen Hancroft[20] writes to Dawson that she had left the Normal School seven years earlier after receiving an elementary diploma, and after having made the usual promise to teach three years in Lower Canada. As she had been unable to find a position as a teacher, she had gone into McLovell's printing offices and had been working there for six years. Now, she thought she was no longer competent to teach but was uneasy as she had not kept her promise and felt as though "my whole life were a lie." She asked to be released from her promise so as to have a quiet conscience. If, however, Dawson wished her to teach she would try, although she felt she was deficient in knowledge having obtained her diploma in the first place, "by merest chance." The tone of this letter is pitifully humble, for if she had been unable to obtain a post after graduating, this would appear to give her the right to complain rather than to apologize. But she, furthermore, is abject in her apology, to the point of absurdity, offering to teach at a time when she had already forgotten what little she ever knew. It is also rather ludicrous to claim that a release from this promise would give her a "quiet conscience", as if in all other

---

[20] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 2211/27/42. April, 1870.

respects, but this minor delinquency, her life was perfectly blameless.

The fourth characteristic of the Normal School was that the students came mainly from less well-to-do families. Tuition was free, in exchange for a promise to teach in Lower Canada for three years after graduation, and there were allowances for boarding and for travel. Lack of money makes for submissiveness, and students who know that their career-opportunities are strictly limited, who have experienced difficulties in entering a particular institution and who see that they can be expelled from that institution without any problem, either through academic failure or through a breach of conduct, and who furthermore, do not pay for their education, such students are willing to do almost anything to get through that institution. They will study hard and will tend to be very circumspect in all their actions.

3. His Encouragement of Activities at the Normal School

The main activity in the McGill Normal School was of course the education of the student teachers. Their number[21] remained quite stable, ranging from 56 in 1857 to 62 in 1868, with a peak of 82 in 1859. Proportionately the highest number of men was in 1857 with about 13 per cent of the student population, or seven men out of 56 students, and the lowest proportion was about five per cent or four men out of 82 students in 1859. The principal teachers were William Dawson, Samson Robins, William Hicks, Professor Fronteau who taught French, and later, James McGregor who joined the staff to teach classics. The academic programme was so full that there was little time for other activities and the Literary Association was the main organized student activity which held meetings at fairly regular intervals during the school years. The Normal School was also host to the Teachers' Association whose meetings were held at the School, which was its headquarters.

The influence of William Hicks in the Teachers' Association is seen in the meeting early in January, 1856,[22] of about 30 young persons who were attending the training institute of the Colonial Church and School Society, to discuss the possibilities of forming a Teachers' Association. Again on June 28, 1856, a meeting of teachers was held at

---

[21] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Student Enrollment, 1857-1868.

[22] Montreal Witness, January, 1856.

the Training School to consider an Association, "to enable instructors . . . to meet. . . and help each other in their arduous yet delightful employment."[23] A further meeting was held on July 5, when a Society was established whose object was the welfare of the teacher and the advancement of education.[24] This Society became known as the Lower Canada Teachers' Association and was to meet at monthly intervals. At the meeting of October 4, there were 22 members present, half of whom taught in the local Anglican School and the other half were teachers-in-training.[25] Among the topics discussed was the possibility of publishing a teachers' magazine, which came out in January 1857 as Le Journal de l'Instruction Publique de la Province de Québec, or the Journal of Education, Quebec. This was bilingual and a departmental publication. It was not published by the Teachers' Association, but was the only voice of the teachers.

At the inauguration ceremonies of the McGill Normal School in March 1857,[26] Hicks advised all teachers to join the Teachers' Association, which would hold annual conventions. He also advised teachers to visit the model school in order to gain fresh hints on improved methods of teaching. Hicks envisaged the McGill Normal School as being a depository

---

[23] Ibid. July 7, 1856.

[24] Ibid. October 15, 1856.

[25] Ibid. October 15, 1856.

[26] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 3, March, 1857.

of School Apparatus, and as having a permanent library of reference.[27]

In the spring of 1857 the Teachers' Association was given a new title, the Teachers' Association in connection with the McGill Normal School. Later, in 1863 and 1864, Dawson took an active part in the formation of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers and became the President of this Association, which was firmly centred in McGill, and held its monthly meetings at the Normal School.[28]

The most important of the student-organized activities of the McGill Normal School during this period appears to have been the Literary Association which was formed early in 1859[29] bythe women students of the senior class, and whose records show that it lasted till about 1874.[30] This Association had many characteristics that indicate a strong desire on the part of the students to organize and perform in a manner that would be pleasing to the authorities of the Normal School. The Association was strict and authoritarian both in its regulations and in its activities. The

---

[27]Montreal Gazette, March 5, 1857.

[28]John Irwin Cooper, "The Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers Centenary Salute", The Educational Record Vol. 80, April to June, 1964, p. 85.

[29]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book of the meetings of the Corporation Committee of the McGill Normal School. February 21, 1859.

[30]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145. Minute Book, Op. cit., September 30, 1874.

language of the bye-laws is full of heavy injunctions.[31] By Article 2, the members are requested to give a pledge to "obey and sustain" existing rules. By Article 8, members absenting themselves from meetings without permission from the President, were to send a written excuse to the secretary to be read to the members who would have to accept the excuse. Article 11 imposed censorship on books to be read, none being permitted except those that were approved by the Select Committee. Article 17 sanctioned the expulsion of any member who broke the rules until a written apology had been sent. Even self-evident actions were autocratically spelled out. Article 15 demanded that the Editress read the papers in a distinct and audible tone. The records show that every effort was made to be as strict and authoritarian in practice as the bye-laws demanded, not always, however, with harmonious results. The officers of the Association were relatively numerous, with imposing titles including President, Editress, Chairman, and Secretary. Very early in the career of the Association, the title President was voted changed to Directress,[32] but the title President, continued to be used, revealing perhaps an anti-feminine bias. At the meeting of November 25, 1862, a motion was passed to construct

---

[31] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Bye-laws of the Normal School Literary Association.

[32] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145. Minute Book of the Literary Association, March 14, 1959.

a Bond of Union by which the members bound themselves to the Association, pledging, in writing, not to leave it until they left the school.

Nevertheless, in spite of all efforts, the membership dropped and on January 13, 1863 even the Secretary, Miss Patterson, and the Editress, Miss Cairns, resigned as they found their duties too strenuous. On January 20, in mid-session, a new President replaced Miss Osborne, and on January 27, a new Editress and Secretary were appointed. The number of members continued to be small and the teachers suggested that students of the junior division be permitted to join. These two problems, resignations of officers and small numbers of members kept cropping up over the years, and were partly dut to the strict and authoritarian regulations and practices.

The teachers of the Normal School appear to have been pleased with the activities of the Literary Association, and Dawson spoke well of its activities, especially after the public meetings. In April 1870, particularly, he congratulated the members on their very marked success, stating that they were a credit to themselves, that they had gratified their friends, and had shown interest in the welfare of their school.[33]

But the main activity at the Normal School was the training of student teachers. By 1871,[34] 647 diplomas had

---

[33]Montreal Gazette, April 20, 1870. Extract in McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book of the Literary Association, April, 1870.

[34]McGill University Archives. Accession No. 145. Minute Book of the Normal Committee Meetings. December 6, 1871.

been granted to 481 individuals, of whom 430 had taught, 230 were at present teaching in Lower Canada, several had gone outside Canada, some had not reported, and some had not obtained positions. The average time spent on teaching was over three years, but some had been teaching from the time they graduated in the early years of the Normal School.

It might justifiably be claimed that without Dawson, the McGill Normal School might even not have existed. He influenced the day-to-day running of the school, and made possible much of the financial support. Nevertheless, the character of the School remained in harmony with the characteristics of the time, without innovative tendencies.

B. WILLIAM HENRY HICKS, 1870-1883

1. His Activities through the McGill Normal Committee

William Henry Hicks was appointed Principal of the McGill Normal School, effective January 1, 1870, on the recommendation of the Committee of the Corporation of the McGill Normal School in a report in December 1869. The appointment was accepted by letter from the Ministry of Public Relations and announced at the meeting of the Committee of the Corporation on March 3, 1870. The same report had recommended the setting up of a standing committee of the Corporation of the Normal School, to be known as the McGill Normal Committee, and it had also reaffirmed the appointments of William Hicks and Sampson Robins as Ordinary Professors of the School. Robins was responsible for the immediate over-sight of the Model School in the Normal School building, and Hicks was responsible for the Bonaventure Street model school and the general supervision of the entire Normal School. William Dawson was to be chairman of the Normal Committee, of which Hicks was to be ex-officio, a member.

This arrangement did not satisfy Robins, who resigned as Ordinary Professor on August 2, 1870, remaining only as Associate Professor of Agriculture and Natural Science to continue his lectures in Chemistry and Natural Philosophy. James McGregor was appointed Ordinary Professor in his place and he was also to continue the teaching of classics in the Normal School. Francis Hicks, the son of William Hicks, was appointed Headmaster of the Bonaventure Model School.

The Normal Committee like its predecessor, the Committee of the Corporation of the McGill Normal School, met every month, with rare exceptions, during the school sessions, and discussed various aspects of school policy. The Normal School Principal's position on the Committee, for several reasons, gave him added prestige. He had unusual insight into the formation of policies, his opinion was frequently requested, and decisions were often delegated to him. In addition there was less likelihood of error because several experienced people expressed themselves on each issue, and to the staff and pupils the principal appeared as more unassailable than if he were acting on his own, especially since the Normal Committee was composed of men each of whom was highly placed in the social hierarchy.

In the Normal Committee, the Normal School Principal was concerned first with financial problems because these affected the salaries, the state of the buildings, and the nature of the studies and extra curricular activities of the students. Various aspects of the financial problems are discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

Second, during this period, there was concern over the nature of the curriculum, and this is discussed in more detail in Part 2 of this section of Chapter II.

Third, there was concern over the state of the buildings quite apart from the financial problem of how to effect repairs. It is difficult to draw accurate conclusions

concerning the buildings from formal documents. These may, for various reasons, understate the deficiencies, so that an impression is left that the buildings were reasonably well cared for and comfortable. It is also possible that frequent references to the need for repairs show great vigilance and that every imperfection is set right quite quickly. If however, an institution has great difficulty in obtaining money, and if the authorities are very anxious to save money, then it can reasonably be assumed that references to defects in the building are made unwillingly and only because the defects are even worse than what is revealed.

At the meeting of the Normal Committee on October 4, 1871, Hicks reported that several applicants to the Normal School were refused because increased accommodation was necessary. This is a tribute to the efficacy of the school, but it does give an impression of cramped quarters with resultant disadvantages. For we may assume that every effort would be made to accept students, and that none would be refused who could at all be accommodated even at some cost through discomfort.

On June 7, 1876, the secretary, W.C. Baines, reported sending a letter to Lesage of the Department of Public Works, stating that Nicholson, a contractor, was prepared to undertake repairs on the east angle of the east wing of the Normal

School, but would not be answerable for breakage in the ornamental stone work. Nicholson requested that Aubertin, an architect, be sent for advice. The Committee itself declared that it would not be responsible for damages that could result "from the condition of the building." In fact, the "condition of the buildings" was to be brought to the attention of the Department. Two months later, at the meeting of August 28, Nicholson was still asked to wait. These observations add to the impression that there were serious defects in the buildings, because all the while more manageable repairs were being made.

On June 6, 1877, Hicks was asked to make a memorandum on the deficiencies of the building, and on June 26, Sheridan, another contractor, was asked to inspect the entire building. On December 5, 1877, the secretary reported that a ventilating shaft was placed to the basement following complaints by Dr. Godfrey. ON June 25, 1878, it was reported that another boiler was needed to heat the Girls' rooms, and on October 2, began a long series of discussions concerning drains to the outhouses on the east end, which went on until April 26, 1881, when Radford, an engineer, presented a report on the state of the drains and outhouses. This led to the formation of a special committee composed of Dawson and Senator James Ferrier who were to head the applications to the Government to effect the necessary repairs, which were not done until September 20, 1882, and even then, not

satisfactorily, since on December 7, 1882, Hicks reported the work was not completed. There was no heating in the outhouses, and a government inspector had been invited who had ordered a hot water attachment to the furnace. By January 1, 1883, nearly everything was ready except the painting.

Meantime on November 3, 1880, the roof of the preparatory school house was reported to be leaking and by April 26, 1881, the teachers were demanding repairs in their rooms.

Thus the impression is that the Normal School buildings were frequently uncomfortable and that the occupants suffered from over-crowding, lack of ventilation, lack of proper drainage, lack of heat in winter, lack of hot water, leaky roofs, and drabness.

Fourth, William Hicks in the Normal Committee, was concerned with problems relating to student policy. The same type of strictness which was observed when Dawson was principal, continued under Hicks and none of the rules of conduct were changed. On May 4, 1871, the Secretary reported Miss Carragh as requesting permission to be absent from morning prayers for personal reasons. This was of course, refused and she was told that she was expected to conform to the rules of the school.

On the question of entrance examinations to the Normal School, it was resolved at a meeting on January 8, 1879, that the School Examination of the University of McGill be

recognized as an entrance to the Normal School, while Hicks was to report on whether Associates in Arts of McGill University could be exempted from examinations for entering Model or Academy classes.

The amount of teaching done by the Normal School students also received attention. On April 3, 1875, Professor Darcy recommended that they be employed as much as possible in giving French lessons in the different classes of the Model School, and again at the meeting of September 11, 1875, it was decided to divide the Normal School students so that one quarter would be teaching in the Model School at any one time. The decision was also taken on September 9, to enable the Academy class to teach only the subjects on their courses without, however, the right to examine their pupils. On March 1, 1879, a suggestion was made by Darcy to increase marks in recognition of the ability to pronounce French correctly, and an increase of 25 was agreed upon, but this was changed, on November 1, 1879 to the granting of a special certificate instead.

The Normal Committee thus gave Hicks added leverage in all his dealings with the Normal School.

2. His Response to Criticism

At the Normal Committee meeting of November 9, 1881, Hicks referred to the criticism leveled against the Normal School by Elson I. Rexford, President of the Association of Teachers and Secretary to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction. The unfavourable remarks concerning the curriculum and teacher-training, had been published in newspapers in Montreal, and a full Normal Committee met to hear Hicks' opening reaction. Present were William Dawson, the Honourable James Ferrier, the Honourable Frederick N. Torrance, the Reverend Dr. Cornish and Mr. J.R. Dougall. Hicks pointed out the unfairness of the remarks and it was agreed that the Chairman, Dawson, would see Rexford, to represent to him, the inexpediency of pursuing such discussions, especially as they were not conducive to its interests, and they concerned themselves with topics that should, more properly, be considered by the members of the Corporation of McGill University, before whom Rexford should present any matters concerning the Normal School. If this manner of presenting the problems were to be rejected by Rexford, the Chairman was authorized to call a special meeting of the Normal Committee. Hicks was meantime, to prepare statements concerning the matters raised by Rexford, for the information of the members of the Committee.

On December 14, 1881 at the Normal Committee meeting, Dawson stated that he had met Rexford but had been unable to change his attitude. The Committee expressed regret, and earnestly deprecated any discussion of matters relating to the curriculum of the Normal School and its management by "an Association connected with the school, and meeting in its building." However, no obstacle would be placed in the way of proposals made in regular form to the Corporation of the University for improvements in the Normal School should such be practicable.

Thus at the Normal Committee meeting of May 3, 1882, the Secretary read a notice of motion submitted to the Corporation of the University on January 25, 1882, to consider the resolution from the Teachers' Association, that the curriculum of the Normal School required revision and the Corporation of the University of McGill was respectfully requested to take such steps in this direction as would in their opinion best promote the interests of education in the Province of Quebec. The subject was referred to the Normal School Committee so that they might prepare their report by October.

Rexford was invited to inform the members of the Normal Committee of the details of the suggested revisions, and these were presented to the members at their meeting on June 7. The remarks were in general terms. First, that one year's study of Greek was not sufficient for the teachers. Second, the practical professional training of pupil teachers

was not receiving the amount of attention that the subject deserved. Third, English and History were not sufficient to give the necessary preparation for teaching, while Mathematics, an extensive and difficult course, should be reduced.

The following suggestions were to be considered. First, practical professional training should not be left so much to the independent action of the model school but should be part of a definite professional course, which would connect and regulate professional training in the different schools. Each model school would be held responsible for carrying out stated portions of this practical course. Model lessons were to be given regularly by teachers of the Model School and by pupil teachers. The pupil teachers were to know what classes they were to take each day in time to prepare their lessons and finally, the pupil teachers were to take notes of lessons and be given practical illustrations of the best methods of presenting different subjects, by the professors of those subjects. Second, the course in English should include a thorough course in grammar and composition with special attention to pronunciation and common errors of speech; a history of the English Language and an outline of English Literature; and a special study of two masterpieces of the English classics each year, one prose and one poetry. Third, no diploma was to be given without a knowledge of at least the outlines of the whole of English, Canadian, and

sacred history. The three years course was to include the whole of English and Canadian history, and outlines of sacred, Roman and Grecian history, as well as Colliers' Great Events of Modern History. Fourth, if necessary, more time should be given to English and History by adopting the following reduced course in mathematics which would provide sufficient mathematical training for the work required from teachers - arithmetic, no change; algebra, to quadratics, including involution, evolution, indices, and surds; geometry, books 1,2,3, parts of 5 and 6; trigonometry. All these changes could be effected without additional expenses.

The Committee resolved to bring these suggestions to the attention of the Corporation of the University of McGill, after Hicks had had an opportunity to examine and comment on them. This involved consultations with members of the staff, especially MacGregor, on the possibility and desirability of reducing the mathematics courses in the Model and Academy classes.

The report of the Normal School Committee on the course of study was presented at its meeting of January 3, 1883, and this was in effect, the Normal Committee's answer to Elson I. Rexford. First, no increase could be given to the time allowed for classics for the Academy diploma, unless a year of study were added, or the staff increased. There was also no advantage to the students of such a change since most of them taught where classics were not required. Second, the Committee was satisfied that the most careful

supervision was exercised over teachers-in-training, who did practice teaching for a large portion of their time. Object lessons and practical management were attended to as branches of study and practice, under the professors of the Normal School. The advantages for practical training in the model school were enjoyed in the McGill Normal School to a greater degree than in any other similar institution on the Continent. Third, courses in English Literature and History would gladly be expanded by the staff, but the students required time for the ordinary English branches required by the law to be taught in the school. Entrance standards could not be raised much, and neither the English courses nor the time spent on professional work could be increased at that time. Additional English Literature and history could be given only at the expense of more elementary work, which would bring immediate discredit to the teachers from those schools which could not be compensated by knowledge not required in their teaching. Fourth, mathematics was a severe course, but within the capabilities of the students and beneficial to them. Reduction in mathematics could not at that time be replaced by increased English. In conclusion, the Normal School gave professional training for teachers, to enable them to meet the requirements of the law, and had provided a class of teachers superior to those otherwise procurable, and did this with means inferior to those in other Normal Schools of most other countries.

Thus, at this time, the proposals put forward by Elson Rexford, were rejected by the McGill Normal Committee. It is indeed hard to understand why the reforms suggested by Elson Rexford caused such a stir. With the exception of the suggestion that mathematics be decreased for the sake of English and History, they were so phrased, that had they been accepted outright, the change would have been scarcely perceptible. The insistence, for example, that more emphasis be given to practical professional training, while high sounding, amounted to little. Moreover it was surely platitudinous to suggest that pupil teachers should know what classes they were to take, so that they could prepare their lessons, or that they should take notes of lessons, or even that model lessons should be given regularly by teachers, and so on. The increased emphasis suggested for English and History too, was of a nature that would make monitoring almost impossible. The attempt, for example, to teach to students of the Normal School a history of the English language, an outline of English literature, plus the whole of English and Canadian history and the outlines of sacred, Roman and Grecian history, and all this as a relatively small part of their total curriculum, such an attempt would almost certainly have run headlong into a position of endless compromises. Furthermore there is what appears like an insuperable paradox between insisting on such an immense area of knowledge on the one hand, and on

the other hand placing equal emphasis on the importance of teaching the same students how to pronounce words and how to avoid common errors of speech. Students who are in need of instruction of the second kind are hardly those that will master instruction of the first kind.

Unfortunately for Hicks, Elson Rexford was well placed to badger him and at the Normal Committee meeting of February 7, 1883, a resolution of the Corporation Committee meeting of January 24, was read. This resolution followed the reading of Hick's report and was moved by Elson Rexford, seconded by Professor McLeod, and passed. It requested the Principal of the McGill Normal School to furnish the Corporation before its next regular meeting, with a detailed statement of the amount of work taken up in class in each subject with the three levels of classes during the session 1881-1882, together with the examination papers set for the June examination, and an outline of the course in Practical Professional Training in the Model School. The Normal Committee asked Hicks to have these documents ready for the meeting on April 25 of the Corporation Committee. It is possible to argue that such a request was unfair to Hicks since it seemed to imply lack of efficiency on his part and subjected him to an almost punitive task hardly merited by the calibre of Rexford's criticisms.

3. Personal Financial Security

During this period, teachers, like most employees, had to fight for their rights individually, especially, for the most important of these rights, the salaries or wages they received. It is only natural, in such circumstances, for the individual to take advantage of whatever circumstance is in his favour, and for those with some authority to ally themselves as closely as possible to those with even higher authority, and to try to adapt to their interests. In the McGill Normal School salary scales this is seen in the big gap between what Hicks and Robins, as Principals of the Normal Schools, plus one or two teachers, received, compared with what the rest of the staff received. From the point of view of keeping salaries in general as low as possible, it paid to give substantially more to those persons who knowing the details of the functioning of an institution, were best placed to make sure that everyone else received the lowest possible salary and yet produced the most possible work. Thus until 1875, Hicks was receiving $1,600[35] per year, and McGregor was receiving $1,400. While the remainder of the staff of the Normal School were receiving between $250. and $400 each, with three exceptions, including Francis Hicks. On April 7, 1875,

---

[35] Ibid., April 7, 1875.

a schedule of increases was presented whereby Hicks' salary was to be increased to $2,000. and McGregor's to $1,800, while the rest of the staff would still be receiving between $250. and $400 each, with the same three exceptions plus Miss Derick, Headmistress of the Primary Department whose salary would rise to $550.

Hicks also promoted his son's interests to an unusual degree. As soon as Robins resigned as Ordinary Professor on August 2, 1870, and James McGregor was appointed Ordinary Professor, Francis Hicks was appointed Headmaster of the Boys' Model School at a salary of $1,100.00, higher than that of every other teacher except Hicks and McGregor. When the proposed increases were suggested on April 7, 1875, Francis Hicks was presented as requiring $1,250.00 as his new salary, which was $500.00 more than that of the teacher, next closest to him, Associate Professor Pierre I. Davey, the proposed increase for whom would give him $750. It should be noted also that Amy F. Murray, Headmistress of the Girls' Model School, with roughly the same responsibilities as Francis Hicks, was too, offered $750. Also on May 3, 1877, Hicks claimed that he had too many lectures to give, and requested that the number be reduced from twelve to ten hours per week, the two hours to be given to Francis Hicks, his son, with the title Associate Professor of English Literature, with an additional salary of $150., to be paid from the ordinary revenue of the school.[36]

---

[36] Ibid., June 26, 1877.

Final approval of this appointment was not received until January 5, 1879, in a letter from the Department of Public Instruction, but interim approval was given on September 5, 1877 by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

So long as Hicks remained Principal of the Normal School, he continued to receive favoured treatment, but after he retired in 1883, he received much less consideration. First, preliminary agreements were that he would retire with $1,000. a year, and the titles Emeritus Principal and Associate Professor. However, various hitches soon began to appear. Hicks found that he had to obtain a diploma from the Provincial Board of Examiners to have his name on the List of Teachers and to be qualified to draw from the Pension Fund. The Secretary of the Normal Committee was instructed to write to him about this at the Normal Committee meeting on October 1, 1884, and it is extraordinary that he had not known it earlier. There followed numerous other delays with regard to the settling of Hicks' pension rights and finally on October 14, 1886,[38] he was informed that he would receive a sum of $400, per year for three years starting from January

---

[37] Ibid., July 9, 1883.

[38] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, McGill Normal School, December 4, 1880 to June 7, 1894.

1, 1887, as his claims under the Pension Act had been recognized by the Administrative Commission. The sum offered was to be in the place of his present pension and in full settlement of all claims on his part against the Normal School. Thus instead of the original $1,000. per year, Hicks was obliged to accept $1,200. less the back stoppages, that is, his own proportion of pension contributions, as a total settlement. Since Hicks died on August 9, 1899,[39] he would have received about $12,500 under the original arrangement, compared with $2,000. plus $1,200., minus back stoppages, which he did receive. Second, the tone used toward him appears very abrupt and even harsh, while he himself appears to have been dissatisfied but unable to say so. Not only had he retired somewhat embittered, but he had lost his son and with him doubtless many hopes and dreams, and his own pension was now drastically curtailed. To the letter written to him on October 14, 1886, he had not replied by December 2,[40] so that he was pressed to do this, and requested to pay all the back stoppages on his pension by December 31, 1886, in order that the final payment might be made to him, on January 1, 1887. Any payment of salary after that date would be illegal, and he was indeed requested to certify his back payments by December 28, 1886.

---

[39] J. Keith Jobling, Hicks, William Henry. Biographical Note.

[40] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, op. cit., p. 155.

William Hicks was the senior professor at the McGill Normal School from the date the School started in 1857 to 1870, when he was appointed Principal. He remained in that position until his retirement in 1883. Before 1857, he was Principal of the Bonaventure Normal School, of the Colonial Church and School Society, which became the McGill Normal School.

His association with the McGill Normal School was thus long and vital, Not only was he constantly alert to the requirements of the school, but he also championed its interests at the Normal Committee whose meetings he does not appear ever to have missed. He also promoted the general welfare of teachers through his work at the Teachers' Associations and ironically he often stressed the importance of securing pension rights perhaps because he realized all too clearly that his own were so insecure.

C. SAMPSON PAUL ROBINS, 1883-1907

1. Special Position Before 1883

Sampson Paul Robins had influence over the affairs of the McGill Normal School for a longer period than anyone else. He spoke at the inauguration ceremonies in 1857, and had the last word at the closing ceremonies in 1907. He was twenty three years old when he became a member of the staff of the McGill Normal School in 1857,[41] after receiving his training at the Normal School in Upper Canada,[42] and serving as Headmaster of the Central School at Brantford, Upper Canada.[43] Robins had in fact been discussed as a proposed professor of the Normal School, on the recommendation of Ryerson, at the Corporation meeting on October 29, 1856,[44] at the same time as Dawson had been discussed as Principal and before Hicks' position had been mentioned. On the first pay list of April 1857, his name appears first, before that of Hicks,[45] and they are both listed as having received £75 (seventy five pounds)

---

[41]John Calam, "McGill Trains Teachers: 1857-1964." The Teachers Magazine, Vol. XLV. No. 223, September 1964.

[42]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/3/1, Prospectus of the McGill Normal School, 1857, p. 1.

[43]John C. L. Andreassen, "A Pictorial History." McGill Journal of Education, Vol. VI, No. 1, Spring, 1971, p. 52.

[44]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145. Minute Book of the Meetings of the Corporation Committee of the McGill Normal School. October 29, 1856.

[45]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/3/57, Pay List, April 1857.

each, from January to April of 1857. It appears as though late in 1856 and perhaps at the beginning of 1857, Robins regarded himself, and was regarded, as senior to Hicks. He says this in his letter to the Corporation Committee of the McGill Normal School, which was read by the Secretary at the meeting of March 3, 1870. Robins claimed that when he was first engaged, his position and salary were equal to those of Hicks, that Hicks accepted his position after Robins had been engaged, and that Robins had seniority because of priority of appointment. In the first announcement of the school and in the pay list, as we have seen, Robins' name came first. However, with the first official announcement of the appointment, the earlier arrangement had been put aside as Hicks was made senior. Despite Robins' protest, his name was removed from the head of the pay list, and it was clear that Hicks was regarded as the senior. The teaching assignments also showed this, for Hicks taught the Senior Division and Robins the Junior Division[46] at the Normal School.

The difference in the positions of the two men widened greatly over the years, and Robins' letter reveals a spirit of rivalry and bitterness. For he continued, stating that he at first regarded the switch in their seniority as a nominal grievance, but a grievance nevertheless, and later

---

[46] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/3/1. Prospectus, op. cit., 1557, p. 3.

he regarded it as creating a substantial injustice. During the time when Dawson was Principal of the Normal School, Robins continued as Ordinary Professor, but the decisions recommended at the Corporation Committee meeting of the McGill Normal School in December 1869, and confirmed at the meeting of January 27, 1870, in a letter from the Ministry of Public Instruction, appear to have had a disturbing effect on him. Robin's letter was read on March 3, 1870, the same date as the meeting of the Corporation Committee of the McGill Normal School which ratified previous recommendations and authorizations. Hicks was by then Principal of the McGill Normal School with an additional salary of $200. and Robins was Associate Professor of Natural Science and Agriculture, also with an additional salary of $200. In his letter, however, Robins claimed that Hicks also had house rent, fuel, and taxes paid, while he had only the $200.

In addition, Robins claimed that the establishment of the Academy Class gave him three times as much additional labour as it did Hicks, especially with the teaching of chemistry and natural philosophy. In short, he claimed that by far the chief portion of the labour relinquished by Dawson, was assigned to him, while the honours of his official position went to Hicks, and furthermore the emoluments attached to Natural History were so divided that Robins believed he was relatively worse paid than before the changes, for while also attending to the Model School, his period of

attending to the Normal School was not at all diminished.

Such was the disappointment of Robins, that in this letter, he requested help to leave his new position. At this time Robins came close to severing his ties with the McGill Normal School. The Committee, however, passed a resolution, recommending that Robins not act in haste, and expressed the hope that the duties would not be quite as onerous as he anticipated. The effect of these deliberations appears to have been to prevent hasty action on the part of Robins, but he was not satisfied and his letter of resignation was presented to a special Normal Committee meeting on July 30, 1870. At this meeting Dawson stated that he would recommend McGregor to replace Robins, after he had consulted Hicks, thus implying that he was prepared to accept the resignation, and at a further meeting of the Normal Committee on August 2, Robins resigned as Ordinary Professor of the McGill Normal School, remaining only as Associate Professor of Agriculture and Natural Science. James McGregor, Headmaster of the McGill Model School, was recommended for the position of Ordinary Professor in the place of Robins, with a salary of $1,400., and he was also to continue teaching classics at the McGill Normal School. The relationship between McGregor and Hicks appears to have been close, whereas the relationship between Hicks and Robins appears to have become more distant,

especially with the appointment of Francis Hicks, till now Headmaster of the Bonaventure Model School, as Headmaster of the McGill Model School at a salary of $1,100.

However, in spite of his strained relationship with Hicks, and to some extent with Dawson, Robins continued as a main-stay of the Normal School and on several occasions addressed the students and guests at the end-of-session ceremonies. His continued influence at the Normal School was due to several factors including his own abilities and his close ties with important people.

2. Period of Least Connection with the Normal School 1870-1883

During the time that Hicks was principal of the McGill Normal School, Robins' connection with the school appears to have been at its weakest. When he resigned as Ordinary professor, he was left with $200. as Associate Professor and immediately asked the Normal Committee to consider increasing this amount to $300., the amount paid to Associate Professors in all other subjects. This the Committee accepted and recommended such an increase to the Minister of Public Instruction, stating that if the latter were unable to effect this raise, the additional $100., or as much of it as possible, would be paid at the end of the session from the school funds.[47] On September 22, 1874, he wrote to the Normal Committee offering his resignation as Associate Professor of Natural History and Agriculture, on the grounds of ill health. It was decided that Hicks would ask Dr. Baker Edward to take over Botany and Agricultural Chemistry and to receive the balance of the salary agreed to with Robins, that is $225., while a letter expressing regret would be sent to Robins. But in fact Robins continued in the school teaching zoology,

---

[47] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book of the Normal Committee Meetings, September 7, 1870.

botany, and/or one hour a week, subjects connected with the Art of Teaching.

The question of Robins' remuneration was again raised at the Normal Committee meeting on April 8, 1874. A letter was read from Dr. Louis Géard, writing on behalf of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Mr. Ouimet, in which he discussed a new project which, if approved, would greatly improve salaries, and which would raise Robins' salary from $300. to $400. In fact, at the Normal Committee meeting on April 28, 1875, Robins' salary was confirmed as $375., while it was decided that applications for further increases be put to the Government through the Minister of Public Instruction.

From 1871 until he became Principal of the McGill Normal School in 1883, Robins was also the Superintendent of English Schools in Quebec.[48] This position probably inclined the members of the McGill Normal Committee toward a desire to keep Dr. Robins on the staff of the Normal School if this were at all possible, and he was given recognition on several occasions, out of proportion to his actual position on the staff. At the Normal Committee meeting on January 4, 1871, for example, it was resolved that the Normal School send delegates to the Board of Arts and

---

[48]George Parmelee, op. cit., p. 429.

Manufactories for Lower Canada, on the same terms as the Colleges. Hicks and Robins were chosen as delegates. Again, at the Normal School staff meeting of April 3, 1875, and at the Normal Committee meeting of May 5, 1875, the decision was taken to ask Robins to deliver the address at the closing ceremonies in June.

The year 1883 marked a change in the fortunes of Robins in his relations with the McGill Normal School, and this year also saw a decline in the affairs of Hicks. For almost two years the latter had faced the determined attack on the curriculum of the Normal School by Elson I. Rexford, and on June 30, 1883, he resigned as Principal. His position was offered to Robins and at the Normal Committee meeting of July 9, 1883, the announcement was made that the latter was to be the Principal and Ordinary Professor of English Language and Literature, as well as Lecturer in the Art of Teaching, and in Natural Science.

During July and August of 1883, Robins appears still to have been uncertain about the amount of his remuneration, and there was some activity over this problem. The efforts to find a satisfactory solution appear to have been somewhat hodge-podge until the Normal Committee meeting of September 5, 1883, when confirmation was received that Robins' salary was to be $2,400, and by January 31, 1885, indeed, Miss L.B. Robins, his daughter, was herself receiving $600.[49]

---

[49]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Cash Book, 1885, month ending January 31.

During July and August, however, of 1883, the main efforts seemed to be directed toward raising the $375. Dr. Robins had been receiving, to $400.[50]; also to making available $600., which at the Normal Committee meeting of July 9, it was announced, had been promised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to help pay increases in the salary of Robins and the salary of Hicks as Emeritus Principal. The availability of these extra $600. was confirmed by Elson I. Rexford at the Normal Committee meeting of September 5, 1883, and they were deposited to the credit of the Normal School, in addition to the regular grants, to be drawn as needed.

---

[50] McGill University Archives Accession No. 145. Letter Book. September 5, 1887.

3. Final Years at the McGill Normal School, 1883-1907

The Normal School had undertaken from the first, to combine professional training and a general education, and in spite of criticism, especially in the early 1880's from Elson Rexford, which contributed to the resignation of Hicks, there was little change either in the curriculum or in organization. The final years of Robins' connection with the McGill Normal School, are also the final years of the school itself. They were the years when he had his greatest share of power and when perhaps his character is best revealed. He appears to have attempted to root out inefficiency, and to institute reforms. But the inefficiencies which be tried to correct were minor and so were the savings. Also, although there were several changes in the number and types of classes at the McGill Normal School during these years, as discussed in more detail in Chapter IV, A2, the changes were due rather to different external conditions, such as the developing relationships between the McGill Normal School and McGill University, and cannot perhaps be properly considered as reforms.

On taking over the direction of the Normal School, Robins attempted to reduce expenditures to even lower than their customary levels, and he seemed to seek out to reprimand and even dismiss members of the staff whom be suspected of carelesness or inefficienty. At one of the earliest Normal Committee meetings that he attended on September 5, 1883, he

requested that all orders for school requirements be submitted to the Principal, and if possible, all accounts be laid before the Normal Committee and initialed by the Chairman before payments. To check carelesness and inefficiency, he focused attention on human failings. At the meeting of December 5, 1883, he asserted that Dr. Edwards could not offer a satisfactory explanation for the bad state of the chemical apparatus, since he, Robins, had left, and at the meeting of January 9, 1884, Edwards was asked to return whatever apparatus was missing. He also singled out McGregor and the janitor, Cooper, as is shown in more detail in Chapter III B3.

During this period, it was becoming increasingly clear that some adaptations to changing external conditions were necessary. At the meeting of the Normal Committee on January 11, 1888, Robins expressed his doubts over the value of keeping the Academy class since the University had opened its doors to women. If the Academy class were dropped, time could be given to science, and to the supervision of student teaching, the lack of the latter being one of the main criticisms of Elson Rexford. It was resolved that a committee be formed of Dawson, the Reverend Dr. Cornish, and Robins to report on the Academy Diploma and to recommend policy. This Committee reported on February 1, 1888, that the Academy class, started twenty three years earlier, was now not required, and that entrance into the University should be direct from the Model Class.

Robins like his predecessors, was conscientiously preoccupied with the day-to-day responsibilities of directing the McGill Normal School, but, like Hicks, he too gives the impression of being agitated and preoccupied by the problems of his own financial security. Such anxieties appear to be fully justified, since not only was it possible for individuals to lose their sources of income but even the danger of closing the school was not wholly absent. At the Normal Committee meeting of April 12, 1884, a request was read from Elson Rexford, for information on teachers from the Normal School, the object of the enquiry being to decide whether the Government should permit the Normal School to continue. The Committee decided to bring the matter to the attention of Senator Ferrier with the request that he watch over the interests of the school, in Quebec. On May 7, 1884, the Reverend Dr. Cornish and Robins formed a committee to confer with Senator Ferrier, requesting additional aid by increasing the Municipal School tax for the Protestant Board of School Commissioners to pay the assistant teachers by special grant. Robins said that Mr. Robertson, the Treasurer, had reassured him that no changes were contemplated with respect to the Normal School. At this time, Robins reported that 1,097 persons had received diplomas since 1857, the history of 641 of whom was known; that 285 of these were still teaching, that sixty-three had

died after teaching an average of four years each, and fifty four were reported as not having taught at all. Robins, like Hicks, seems to have thought that these kinds of statistics were significant demonstrations of the success of the Normal School.

In spite of the continued assurances from the Normal School authorities of the adequacy of the school to meet its obligations, there was pressure from the Protestant Board of School Commissioners. On February 19, 1895,[51] a letter was sent to this board, signed by the Chairman of the Normal Committee, admitting the right of the Board to inspect the Model School even if that meant that their grant might not be renewed. Subsequently, the Normal Committee, as though confirming a certain dependence, on several occasions, sent letters thanking the Board for their kindness.

But while on the one hand, the very existence of the Normal School seemed threatened, on the other hand, there were continual efforts to gain greater grants. In the Principal's Report of 1899-1900[52] Robins refers to an additional grant of $3,000. to the McGill Normal School which would make possible more individual oversight, more superintendence and administration, raise salaries and enable outside lecturers to come in. In his letter to the Honourable H.T. Duffy, Minister of Public Works, dated

---

[51] Ibid., p. 27.

[52] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Principal's Reports, 1899-1900.

April 5, 1900, Beckenridge, Secretary of the McGill Normal Committee, wrote that the Normal Committee hoped that the amount of the increased subsidy would not be less than $3,000.[53] On May 14, Beckenridge, writing to J.E. Robidoux, Provincial Secretary, and presenting a statement of the financial position of the McGill Normal School, which would later be more formally presented through the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, stated that in conference with the Honourable H.T. Duffy on May 11, $4,000. was calculated to be necessary, apart from expenditures on repairs and maintenance to be undertaken by the Department of Public Works. This sum would be used for additional assistants to the Model School, administration and superintendence, increased salaries, and special courses by outside experts. Robidoux was asked to give his personal attention to this matter and to bring it before the government, while a more formal application would be sent to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction. By this time Robins' own salary, which had risen steadily, was $2,400. plus a bonus of $200., and the increase requested was a further $400., bringing the total to $3,000., while Miss Robins' salary had reached $720. by 1889.[54]

---

[53] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, op. cit., p. 291.

[54] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Cash Book, 1889.

The engagement of Miss Robins on the staff of the Normal School was first raised by Dr. Robins at the Normal Committee meeting of June 27, 1884, when he enquired whether she could be engaged as assistant in the Normal School at $500., the exact nature of the work to be decided later. This decision was apparently made at the Normal Committee meeting of September 10, 1884, although no details are given, and at the meeting of October 7, 1885, it was agreed to move the salary of Miss Robins from the General Account to the Model School Account. Her work assignments varied from time but on June 2, 1886, she was recommended by Robins to teach penmanship for an additional $100., and on January 11, 1888, Robins proposed that on McGregor's resignation, he, Robins, would teach Mathematics, the Art of Teaching, and Natural Science, while English and the Classical Languages would be given to a new person. Miss Robins' role would then be to help both Robins and the new person. She would teach Mathematics for six hours, English for ten hours, and would devote a further four hours to helping the principal, for a total of twenty hours.

That these salaries showed an inordinate concern to shore up Robins' own position, can be seen by comparing them with other salaries. Miss Selina F. Sloan, for example, after teaching for 29 years, and being Headmistress of the Primary Department of the Model School was earning $480 in 1897. The increase requested for Robins, over and above the

bonus, was $400. By itself it is almost equal to the entire salary of Miss Sloan, and it is over one third of the entire increase requested for salaries. Out of $1,100 to be devoted to the raise in salaries, $400. was for Robins, and $700. was to be shared by Professor A.W. Kneeland, ($200.), Professor S. Cornu, ($100.), the Headmaster of the Boys' School ($300.), and the Headmistress of the Girls' School ($100.). The remainder of the staff would receive nothing. On June 11, 1900, at the Committee meeting, there was assurance from the Protestant Committee that authorization would be given by the Government for these increases.

Robins, like Dawson and Hicks, served the Normal School for many years, and the fact that the School functioned day after day during all these years, is a tribute to their abilities. The changes, however, which perhaps Robins once hoped were possible, were not sufficiently carried out, and the insecurity of his own position affected him somewhat in the same way as Hicks had been affected, so that improvements were more noticeable in his personal fortunes than in those of the community that he led.

CHAPTER III

THE STAFFS OF THE NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS

A. STAFF ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES

1. Positions on the Staff

The synopsis of the roles of the three principals of the McGill Normal School leads to a more detailed examination of their connections with their staffs and a closer look at the attitudes and nature of the staffs. The McGill Normal School included the student teachers, who were in the Normal School proper and the Model Schools: the Boy's Model School, the Girls' Model School, and the Primary Department of the Model School.

The Principal of the McGill Normal School had the oversight of the Normal and Model Schools including teaching and supervisory staffs and the students and pupils. In many cases the duties were delegated, but in others there was a direct link between the Principal of the Normal School and a member of the personnel who from the point of view of rank or financial reward, was quite far removed from him, as for example, the janitor. The Principal was helped by the Normal Committee of McGill University which, with him and a Secretary, numbered six. The School was controlled by the Corporation of McGill University together with the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Province

of Quebec, and was answerable also to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction.

From the very beginnings of the McGill Normal School, professors were divided into Ordinary Professors and Associate Professors.[1] The former could teach several branches of the disciplines, with a maximum salary $1,750.00.[2] The latter could teach one or more separate branches and were often employed part time. Their maximum salary was set at $500.00.[3] Only an Ordinary Professor could become Principal.[4] All teachers were at first nominated by the Superintendent,[5] but later they were nominated and appointed by the Normal Committee, and confirmed in their appointments by the Governor-General-in-Council.

The Normal School opened with three professors and this number increased rapidly in the first few years. By 1898-1899 the Normal School had about 13 teachers and the Model Schools

---

[1] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, Art IV. Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, No. 12.

[2] Ibid., No. 13.

[3] Ibid., No. 14.

[4] Ibid., No. 12.

[5] Ibid., Article VII, No. 31.

about 11.[6] This number seems to have reached a maximum in 1904-1905 when there were 21 teachers in the Normal and 15 in the Model Schools.[7] The number of students and pupils in the Normal and Model Schools increased gradually over the years to about 450 in the Model Schools[8] and about 133 in the Normal School[9] in 1900-1901. In the latter the annual average number of student-teachers from January 1, 1857 to December 31, 1879, is given as 89 in a report by the Secretary of the Normal Committee to the members of that Committee in 1880.[10]

There were regular staff meetings, and as reaffirmed in the by-laws of the McGill Normal School in March 1889,[11] a conference of the Principal, the professors, and the teachers, was to take place on the first Saturday of every school month at 11 a.m., and due notice of this meeting was to be given by the Principal to the Chairman of the Normal School

---

[6]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus of the McGill Normal School, 1898-1899.

[7]Ibid., 1904-1905.

[8]Ibid., 1900-1901.

[9]Ibid., 1900-1901.

[10]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, December 1, 1880.

[11]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/7, By-laws of the McGill Normal School, March 1889.

Committee, so that he could attend on behalf of the Normal Committee.

Some teachers were not on the Government Pay List, which indicated an absence of full recognition with consequent disadvantages regarding increases in salary, stability of tenure, and pension rights. A partial list of such teachers in 1875 indicated seven,[12] and another partial list in 1883 indicated the same number.[13] Acceptance on the Pay List does not seem to have depended on any particular qualification, other than a request by the Normal School authorities. The list of 1875 mentioned Lucy Derick who was in charge of the Primary Department of the Model School as not being on the Pay List, and those not on the pay list of 1880 included John P. Stephen, soon to be Headmaster of the Boys' Model School; Mary I. Peebles, soon to be Headmistress of the Girls' Model School; Selina P. Sloan, later Headmistress of the Primary Department of the Model School. On the other hand, James Cooper, the janitor, was on the Regular Government Pay List. Lucy Derick, was not placed on the Regular Pay list until November 12, 1883,

---

[12] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., April 7, 1875.

[13] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. cit., 4 Dec. 1880 to 7 June 1894, p. 74.

although she had been in the service of the McGill Normal School since the first of February 1860, and had for many years been in charge of the Primary Department of the Model School and was, by courtesy, considered Headmistress.

As in all schools, several of the teachers had long years of experience. The Normal School Prospectus of 1895-96[14] shows that by then Lucy H. Derick had 44 years of teaching experience. Mary I. Peebles had 21, Selina F. Sloan 29, Jane A. Swallow 27, and Sampson Robins 49. So that by the time the Normal School closed in 1907, Robins had about 60 years of experience as a teacher.

At the Normal Committee meeting on February 6, 1884, Robins recommended that for the first time, a female professor, "of high standing", be appointed to the Normal School the following year. This recommendation was approved at the meeting of June 25, 1884, and Robins suggested that such a person would be satisfied with a salary of $1000.00. At the meeting of March 8, 1886; Mme Sophie Cornu replaced Professor Davey as instructor in French, and on May 5, 1886, she became the first female professor in the Normal School, receiving the same salary as her male predecessor, $750.00.

The interrelationships among members of the staff, and the attitudes and opinions of teachers are analyzed in more

---

[14]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1895-1896, p. 18.

detail in the remaining sections of this chapter, but it may be mentioned here that they worked long hours and their positions were insecure compared to the security of positions in many countries today. This is seen particularly in the necessity for each individual to struggle independently not knowing exactly what others were aiming at or how successfully their aims were being achieved. In the Normal School, the student time-tables were from 9 a.m. to 12 noon, and from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.[15] from Monday to Friday, and from 9 a.m. to 12 noon on Saturday. This would keep a full-time teacher on the job from about 8.30 a.m. to about 5.30 p.m. from Monday to Friday, and from about 8.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. on Saturday, or about 49 hours a week. To this we must add hours of preparation, supervision, administrative work and other responsibilities. Beyond this was the toll paid for a feeling of insecurity. The teacher had to worry about whether his or her various rights and privileges, present and future, were protected, whether a competitor might creep in and undermine, or whether a government, itself looking around anxiously to save what it could, might not whittle away at some gain, or even cut it out boldly. Everyone was on the look-out for a chance to gain, whether by a better salary, by employing a son or a daughter, by having extra work, or by whatever other means were available.

---

[15] Ibid., 1873-1874.

2. Problems of Insecurity

There is a great deal of evidence to show that although the teachers at the McGill Normal School were paid above the average for teachers, and that in general, they were a privileged group among teachers, yet there was a sense of insecurity among them. Above all, it seemed to be fear of finding oneself without money, especially since individuals had nowhere to look for support except to themselves, and perhaps to members of their own families. It was possible for any member of the staff who was not on the Government Pay List that is to say whose position was not officially recognized, to find himself or herself without a position at the end of any year with very little notice and for a great variety of reasons. Even those who were on the Pay List faced the danger of sickness or some unforeseen event which could deprive them totally of their income. It was natural therefore that a two-fold struggle should take place while a teacher was working and while the going was good. The first was a constant effort to improve earnings by striving to increase salary, or to find extra work or to place one's relatives as favourably as possible. The second was to seek to make the best possible arrangement for pensions. Both these struggles were difficult but more especially the second since a pension is not an immediate need, one moreover that human beings tend to ignore until they begin to approach retirement age, and above all it was not even a right in the

nineteenth century, and was still regarded with some suspicion. Hicks was well aware of the value of pensions and mentioned them as early as 1857 at the Inauguration Ceremonies.[17] He tried hard to secure his own pension but was not successful, for he ended with a greatly curtailed amount, as shown in chapter II.

If Hicks who was eminently well placed to secure his own pension, was nevertheless unable to do this, how much more difficult was it for almost everyone else. His son, Francis Hicks, is another illustration both of the principle of attempting to do what one can while that is possible, and of the impossibility of gaining certain rights which other societies and other ages, have accepted as normal. Francis Hicks' career in 1870, must have seemed bright. He was then appointed Headmaster of the Boys' Model School,[18] with a salary of $1100.00 higher than this position had ever previously earned, higher than almost all other salaries in the Normal School at the time, and higher than what his successors received until the beginning of the twentieth century. Furthermore, during his time as active Headmaster, until 1882, Francis Hicks received increases and promotions. On April 28, 1875, it was decided that a recommended increase to salaries be presented to the Government through the Minister of Public

---

[17] Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, No. 3, March 1857.

[18] McGill University Archives, Accession 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., March 3, 1870.

Instruction.[19] The salary recommended for Francis Hicks, as previously mentioned dwarfed the salary of Miss Amy F. Murray, Headmistress of the Girls' Model School, a post presumably parallel and equal to his own, but she was recommended for $750.00. These salaries were in fact accepted, except that in the case of Miss Murray, when she drowned in August 1875, her successor, Miss Jane Ann Swallow, was given $650.00.[20]

On June 6, 1877, Francis Hicks was recommended as Associate Professor of English Literature for two hours per week, for an additional sum of $150.00, to be paid from the ordinary revenue of the School, bringing his total to $1400.00.[21] At this time Francis Hicks was in a favoured position, his advance effected by people who were willing and able to help him.

Yet when misfortune struck and Francis Hicks became seriously ill in 1882, it was apparent almost at once that

---

[19] Ibid., April 28, 1875.

[20] Ibid., September 1, 1875.

[21] Ibid., June 6, 1877.

his income was seriously jeopardized and it must have been a terrible blow to Hicks who from this point on began to fight a losing battle. On January 3, 1883, it was announced that the Headmaster, Francis Hicks was still unable to attend to his duties, because of severe illness.[22] This imposed extra work on the first and second assistants, who had required the aid of an extra teacher during the examinations, and the help of Hicks and McGregor, as well as some of the senior teachers-in-training. Hicks was clearly under great strain to prevent any actual replacement for his son. At this point John P. Stephen was acting as Headmaster without official recognition, and Miss Shanks was acting as second assistant. Some remuneration would soon have to be found to pay them for their extra duties. At the Normal Committee meeting of February 7, 1883, Hicks showed a certificate from Dr. W.C. Glasgow of St. Louis, Missouri, dated January 16, stating that Francis Hicks was suffering from a lung disease which necessitated his staying in a warm climate and he recommended that he remain in S.W. Texas. A bonus was recommended for John Stephens of $100.00 and another one of $50.00 for Miss Shanks. But unfortunately and naturally, this was not satisfactory to them. On March 7, 1883, John Stephen's letter was read, in which he wrote that the bonus was entirely inadequate but

---

[22] Ibid., January 3, 1883.

that he would accept it, since no more money was available. The acceptance was clearly of a temporary nature. Obviously if Francis Hicks did not recover his health, he would be forced to relinquish most, if not all, of his income. By June 28, when another certificate from Dr. W.C. Glasgow was read, dated June 21, 1883, it was clear that since he was suffering from a pulmonary and laryngeal disease, requiring an open air life away from Canada, he would have to be replaced. The Committee recommended a leave of absence on roughly half salary or $625.00, and John Stephen was appointed First Assistant with $600.00. Shortly after this, Hicks retired and when his son Francis died in 1884, the only pension he received was that the balance of $625.00 for that year was paid to his family. Thus the Hicks family was to receive very little more money from the teaching profession. From July 1, 1884, Hicks received $2,000.00 to July 1, 1886, when he received the final $1,200.00 on December 31, 1886, after paying back stoppages of about $900.00.[23] Yet Hicks lived till August 9, 1899, and his wife survived him. Their situation, furthermore, was not helped by the fact that Robins succeeded Hicks as Principal of the McGill Normal School, because there is no evidence to show that the latter by deed or even word, did anything to help them. On the contrary, Robins seemed to have acted in all respects as though he was anxious

---

[23] Ibid., December 1, 1886.

to assume the new position and to make the most of it. Relations between him and Elson Rexford, the great advocate of reform while Hicks was principal, were harmonious from the beginning, although scarcely any reforms were carried out in the Normal School, and Elson Rexford was even placed on the staff giving lectures on Education Law and the Obligations of Teachers.[24]

The career of James MacGregor is also interesting, both as showing the efforts made to improve positions while this was possible, and also as showing the insecurities of the positions. He was appointed Ordinary Professor upon the resignation by Robins of this position in 1870, with a salary of $1,400.00 and with good prospects for increases. Yet at the Normal Committee meeting of September 30, 1874, his letter was read announcing that he had started his own boarding school at Cote des Neiges on September 29. Presumably, one of the reasons he did this, was to increase his income, because there was no question of his resigning his position on the McGill Normal School. The immediate reaction of the Normal School Committee was to permit him to do this, on condition that his work at the Normal School was not interrupted, and if the Committee judged that there was interference with his work, he was to give up the boarding school. The members of the Normal Committee were

---

[24]Ibid., January 7, 1885.

obviously not satisfied with this arrangement, and at the meeting on March 3, 1875, McGregor was told that all his time would have to be devoted to the Normal School. At the following meeting, on April 7, 1875, McGregor informed the Normal Committee that he would have to give further thought to the decision that had been taken, as he had spent much money adapting the house to its new purpose. The Committee decided to offer him $1,800.00 as a salary if he gave up his private school. He accepted this offer and immediately began to liquidate his school which, however, was not easy, so that on June 7, 1876, he asked for more time, and on May 3, 1877 he had still not completed the disposal of his school, promising only to try to complete the business by that summer. At this meeting, he was, however, given an ultimatum, to be ready to aid the Principal of the McGill Normal School by the Fall of 1877, and to this, he gave his consent on June 6.

Unfortunately for McGregor, his position was not a favoured one after Robins became principal. On October 25, 1887, the Normal Committee introduced a resolution that it

be suggested to McGregor, that he place his resignation in the hands of the Committee before July 1, 1888, and that if he did this, a gratuity of $450.00 would be paid to him out of the funds of the Normal School. This was to be communicated to him by the Secretary, which was done on December 9, 1887,[25] when he was asked to send his letter of resignation to the Secretary of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction before their next meeting in February, 1888.[26] In many ways this offer and the manner it was communicated, were rather demeaning to McGregor, and on November 2, 1887, a letter was read from McGregor, in answer to a verbal communication of this resolution from Dawson, in which he stated his objections "to the place proposed for his retirement."[27] The Committee in a second resolution expressed regret that their proposal did not meet with his approval and stated that they were sympathetic to his views, because of his long and valuable service, and would endeavor to secure more favourable conditions. He was asked to prepare an amended statement confined to the actual reasons for the claims he made, and which could be used to his interest. A

---

[25] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book., Op. Cit., p. 198.

[26] McGill University Archives. Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., November 2, 1887.

[27] Ibid., November 2, 1887.

special meeting would be called on his reply. This took place on November 16, 1887, and McGregor's statement began "I cannot, I am sorry to say, accept this."[28] He insisted that the bonus should be $900.00 or that he be permitted to stay on for another two years and resign without bonus. The information that he sent concerning his thirty-year connection with the school, stated that he had organized the Boys' Model School in 1857, starting with six boys, and having a full school within a few months. He also mentioned Elson Rexford's reference to his work as being "the backbone of the Normal School".

The Normal Committee sent this statement to the Rev. Canon Norman for his sub-committee and for the Protestant Committee, with the recommendations that first, if six months' salary, or $900.00 were to be given to McGregor, then every facility was to be allowed the Normal School to provide the necessary funds "without cramping the efficiency of the school",[29] and second, there were difficulties in permitting McGregor to stay on for another two years, so that if this were done, the Normal Committee would have to do its best to, "secure the efficiency of the school during this time." It is clear that McGregor was no longer wanted

---

[28] Ibid., p. 262.

[29] Ibid., p. 266.

at the Normal School, and the person who most likely gave voice to this feeling was Robins. Earlier, at the Normal Committee meeting of October 5, 1887, a letter had been received from Elson Rexford which stated that the Protestant Committee, on September 21 had appointed the Rev. Canon Norman, Dr. Heneker, and the Rev. Dr. Matthews as a sub-committee to confer with the Normal School Committee and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on the appointment and removal of professors of the Normal School and to report at the next meeting of the Protestant Committee. The Rev. Canon Norman who was present at the Normal Committee meeting of October 5, 1887, stated that the Protestant Committee wanted McGregor to retire "in the interest of the School".[30] Again it appears as though the information causing the Protestant Committee to come to this decision, came from Robins.

On December 7,[31] the Rev. Canon Norman writing on behalf of the sub-committee advised that the first recommendation of the Normal Committee was accepted. The Normal Committee therefore, requested Professor McGregor to hand in his resignation to take effect on July 1, 1888, and receive $900.00, out of the Model School fees. At the following Normal Committee meeting on January 11, 1888, Robins suggested

---

[30] Ibid., p. 254.

[31] Ibid., p. 267.

that McGregor be replaced in the following manner. Robins himself would now be in charge of Mathematics, the Art of Teaching, and Natural Science, while a new person would be in charge of English and the Classical languages, who would also use Miss Robins to help him. Miss Robins' new time-table would be-mathematics six hours, English ten hours, helping Principal four hours, a total of 20 hours, compared to 14 hours before the change, with commensurate increase in salary. Robins' own teaching time would go from 14 to 16 hours.

3. Salaries

The two main sources of revenue for the McGill Normal School were Government grants and Model School fees. From these funds all expenses were paid except those required for major repairs or additions to the buildings, and these were paid by the Board of Works. Government grants rose with a few setbacks, fairly steadily from 1857 to 1879, from $6,469.11 in 1857 to $15,200.00 in 1879, and the Model School fees rose in a similar manner from $867.35 in 1857 to $2,974.39 in 1879. The salaries paid to the Principal and Professors in 1857 amounted to $4,284.17 plus $388.67 to the secretary and janitors, and $10,649.07 plus $799.92 in 1879.[32] In later years, a few additional sources of revenue appeared. At the Normal Committee meeting on November 21, 1903, the Government Grant is stated as $16,866.67, the Model School fees are given as $3,750.00, and in addition there are $2,000.00 from the City of Montreal, $1,000.00 from the Montreal Protestant Board of School Commissioners for the Model Schools, and $1,500.00 from the fees of Normal School students resident in Montreal.[33]

The salaries paid to teachers at the McGill Normal School were distinctly better than those paid to teachers in the elementary and secondary schools. The lowest salary

---

[32] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Cash Book, Summary of Revenues and Expenditure, 1879.

[33] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145. Minute Book, Op. Cit., November 21, 1903, p. 486.

in the former was $250.00 and most teachers received $300.00 to $400.00, while in the latter, salaries, as late as 1901, ranged from about $140.00 to $216.00[34] and in the country they reached as low as $70.00. What is even more unpleasant about these latter salaries is that they were categorized so that a salary of $16.00 a month was considered usual, $17.00 a month was considered satisfactory, and $18.00 a month was considered distinctly good.[35] It must also be borne in mind that a salary could be paid over a ten-or a twelve-month period, so that $17.00 a month could meant anywhere from $170.00 a year to $204.00 a year. In this categorization, whereas the gulf that separates a "low" payment from a "distinctly good" payment would appear to be rather wide, we see that in practice, this is transmuted into a very slender monetary difference of $4.00 a month. Thus at a very slight cost, not only is the recipient immediately satisfied but a feeling is created that even future prospects are good.

A typical characteristic of the salary payments at the McGill Normal School is the wide range between the salaries of Principals and one or two favoured individuals on the one hand, and those of the rest of the staff on the other hand. This characteristic has already been mentioned, and reasons

---

[34] John Adams, The Protestant School System in the Province of Quebec. New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. Montreal: E.M. Renoux, 1902, p. 32.

[45] Ibid., p. 33.

for it have been suggested. Furthermore, salary payments were arranged individually in most cases. Thus salaries were treated as confidential, or perhaps we might say secret, since it is only natural that people object when they know that someone else is receiving more for the same amount of work. This leads to a certain distrust and suspicion since on the whole, people are unaware of each others' earnings, and are therefore not sure whether or not they are being treated justly. There is also a feeling of uncertainty, as to just how far a claim can be pressed or whether it should be presented at all. It is hard to tell whether one is ambitious enough or whether one is being too timid. These thoughts cause anxiety and dissatisfaction. There develops a tendency to intrigue, to flatter, to look for alliances, or more simply, to do as little as possible. The employee usually does not know much about the financial intricacies of an organization and is at a great disadvantage trying to defend himself or herself. This causes frustration and ill-feeling. A major reason for such a disparity in salary scales is indeed very probably this very inability of the individual to defend himself, and unreasonable disparity decreases in proportion as the ability to defend oneself increases, as is demonstrated by the history of teachers' salary scales. Finally, in keeping with the principle of paying the lowest possible price for every article, women tended to receive less than men, although this does not

apply in cases here and there, where women happened to be particularly strong or had strong help.

The story of Jane Swallow's salary reveals several of these characteristics. Until September 1, 1875, she received $350.00 but when Amy F. Murray drowned in August 1875, and Jane Swallow took her place as Headmistress of the Girls' Model School, she was given $650.00,[36] which was a good increase. However, as a woman, she was receiving much less than her male counterpart, Francis Hicks, and she was receiving less also, because she did not have the personal backing that Francis Hicks had. Furthermore, the salary offered Jane Swallow, and accepted by her, was in fact $100.00 less than what Amy Murray had been offered under the new scale just before her death. It is not clear when Jane Swallow realized this, but sooner or later, she did realize it, and there was definitely a dissatisfaction at what seemed to her, unjust discrimination. We may presume that she made determined and continuous efforts to find someone to back her, for early in 1883, the Honourable W.W. Lynch wrote to the Normal Committee requesting that her salary be raised by $100.00 to $750.00.[37]

---

[36] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., September 1, 1875.

[37] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. Cit., 1883.

On July 4, 1883,[38] Jane Swallow's request for this increase was read and considered, and at the meeting of July 9, it was decided to present the proposed increase to the Government, through the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the increase was approved on October 3, 1883. In spite of all this, on April 2, 1884,[39] a request by Jane Swallow was read, that she be paid her present salary retroactively to the time she first assumed duties as Headmistress, eight years earlier. This was that difference of $100.00 per year just mentioned, which meant a total of $800.00. Her request was flatly refused. In fact it was perhaps regarded as somewhat an enormity, and is an indication of the extent of Jane Swallow's disapproval of the discrimination against her.

This request and its refusal, appear to have left scars, although Jane Swallow continued as Headmistress for another nine years, until 1892. When Mary J. Peebles succeeded her as Headmistress of the Girls' Model School, the Secretary of the Normal Committee, Beckenridge, on February 18, 1892, wrote somewhat harshly to Jane Swallow[40] suggesting that she was fired, and when he wrote to her again on February 24, it was to tell her that all matters relating to her relief were to be dealt with by the Principal.[41] This meant that

---

[38] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., July 4, 1883.

[39] Ibid., April 2, 1884.

[40] Ibid., p. 383.

[41] Ibid., p. 400.

Robins, and there are reasons to suggest that he wanted to get rid of her, was anxious to isolate her from any sympathetic hearing, confident evidently in his own strength to deal with her. It was four months before Jane Swallow, in a letter dated June 16, 1892 appears to have recovered sufficiently to show any resistance, and this, when it finally came, was mild enough, a request for some kind of pension. The reply was prompt, sent on June 22, and she was informed that her claim would be considered. The net result of this consideration, however, was that on September 7, 1892, it was decided that Miss Jane Swallow, retiring headmistress of the Girls' Model School, was to be given $200.00 in full pension payment for her thirty years of service.[42] This payment just over one quarter of one year's salary, was to be authorized by the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction.

---

[42] Ibid., p. 410.

B. ATTITUDES OF THE AUTHORITIES TOWARD THE STAFF

1. Towards Income Decisions and Hiring

On most requests for salary improvements and on hiring policies, the decisive authority was the Normal Committee, but naturally, individuals, particularly the Principal, were able to sway opinion. The consideration given to a request for a salary or a pension improvement, depended to a great extent, on the importance given to the person making that request. Some senior teachers and the Principals were given much attention, except at those moments when it had become clear that they were to lose their positions for ever.

The rigid general policy was not to pay more than what was absolutely necessary to keep a particular teacher in his or her place. In economic terms each person was purchased at his or her lowest marginal cost. This principle superceded but did not exclude discrimination against women, while the latter discrimination was not so much a principle as a factor which lowered the marginal cost of women, just as other factors lowered the marginal costs of both men and women. Most teachers and employees were treated somewhat summarily, and even cruelly, as befitted a situation where maximum economy had to be practised. In almost every single case where a salary increase was requested by a teacher earning $600.00 or less, when the increase was granted, it was quite small, and at times, very small. At the Normal Committee meeting of

June 28, 1882,[43] for example, honorariums of $25.00 each were given to Miss Sloane, Miss Peebles, and Miss Shanks, all three, able and experienced teachers; and on July 4, 1883,[44] a $25.00 gratuity was given to Miss Cooper, the matron.

It was also a practice when a teacher became ill, to hire someone else at a very low salary, while at the same time cutting off that portion of the salary of the sick teacher which corresponded to the time when the replacement was hired. On May 2, 1883,[45] Miss Shanks' illness made it necessary to hire Maude Clarke in her place at $25.00 a month, but at the same time Miss Shanks' salary for the period corresponding to the hiring of Maude Clarke, was cut completely. Yet on November 2, 1882,[46] it was recognized that Miss Shanks, with John P. Stephen, had done a great deal of extra work, because of the illness of Francis Hicks.

On April 11, 1883,[47] Miss Peebles was appointed to the place of Miss Francis who had recently resigned, and her salary was raised to $375.00. Her own place was taken by Miss McNaughton as announced at the meeting of June 28, 1883,

---

[43] Ibid., June 28, 1882.

[44] Ibid., July 4, 1883.

[45] Ibid., May 2, 1883.

[46] Ibid., November 2, 1882.

[47] Ibid., April 11, 1883.

at a salary of $250.00. This was $50.00 less than what Miss Peebles had been getting. Again, it is not clear when Miss McNaughton found out this difference, but at the Normal Committee meeting of April 2, 1884, her complaint was discussed and her request that her salary be raised to equal that of her predecessor. The decision was that her request could not be entertained.

On March 4, 1884, letters on behalf of the Normal Committee were sent to John Andrew, who had been teaching Elocution and Reading for 25 years, and Mr. Bird, who taught drawing, to increase the number of lessons they gave, or to accept a lower salary since the session was to end in May. On April 1, Bird's reply was received, that he would resign and in his place, Nancy E. Green was appointed with the stipulation that she was to teach four hours instead of two, for the same salary.

On June 6, 1888,[48] Selina F. Sloan's request for an increase was considered. After 17 years of teaching her salary was $375.00, and in her own words, she was now "begging" for an increase of $75.00. The Committee agreed to a $25.00 increase.

The attitude of the Normal Committee toward teacher incomes, and the influence on these attitudes of a few individuals is clearly illustrated in the problems of 1880.

---

[48] Ibid., June 6, 1888.

On February 11, 1880,[49] a letter was read from the Superintendent of Public Instruction concerning a reduction of the Annual Grant by $1,330.00, and it was decided that this sum would have to be made up as far as possible by reducing contingent expenses. On April 7, the Secretary was instructed to write to Barnjum, who instructed in Drill, Dr. Baker Edwards, Science Master, P.I. Fowler, Music Teacher, and two assistant teachers in the Model School, informing them that if the reduction in the Grant was carried through, the Normal Committee would not be responsible for their positions. At the meeting of September 8, the members of the Committee were informed that Dawson had written to Hicks on August 28, to dismiss the teachers who had been warned in April, except for the two junior teachers in the Model School. Thus the maximum possible money was saved. Edwards had replied proposing to continue at a reduced salary, and so did P.I. Fowler, foregoing $92.00 for the hire of pianos and $80.00 from extra teaching in the Model School. The Committee accepted these counter-offers, guaranteeing Edwards $50.00 and if possible, $100.00, and promising Fowler that there would be an effort to pay him the $92.00 and later, perhaps, even the $80.00. The plans for reducing expenses in their final approved form were as follows:

---

[49] Ibid., February 11, 1880.

gymnastics discontinued $200.	$ 200.00
bursaries reduced 5 percent	66.00
salary for music diminished	80.00
salary for chemistry diminished	50.00
salaries from two model school teachers at $300.00 each.	600.00
one assistant less	400.00
	$1,396.00

Thus the reduced grant was covered by suitable reductions elsewhere. But it will be noticed that whereas relative sacrifices were demanded of the students and some teachers, and absolute sacrifices were demanded of other teachers, the remaining teachers not only sacrificed nothing but on the contrary based their whole gain on the sacrifices, relative and absolute, of a few colleagues. There is no record of a single protest against such conduct.

Interesting insight into hiring practices is also provided by a letter addressed by Dawson to Robins on July 30, 1892.[50] In this letter Dawson was discussing the relative advantages of hiring one of two ladies as kindergarten teachers. He said that he had a good opinion of both ladies as far as their formal characters and fitness were concerned. Miss McKenzie, he presumed, had more experience of that special work. Miss Derick, on the other hand, knew the ways and position of the Normal School better. Miss McKenzie might, in addition to the extra $100.00 offered, expect more in speedy

---

[50]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 267/18, July 30, 1892.

increases in salary. Miss Derick would be more likely to be contented for a time. Miss McKenzie would have more prestige, but Miss Derick would probably give less trouble in the future. There was also the question of favouring their own former student. His opinion, therefore, inclined a little toward Miss Derick. He suggested however, that if, after seeing Miss McKenzie's testimonials, Robins still thought she was worth $100.00 added to $500.00, he would be glad if Robins selected her. As it happened, Miss McKenzie found a job in Ontario, and left.

2. Favouring Certain Members of the Staff

There were several teachers at the McGill Normal School who seem to have been treated with exceptional favour, and it is perhaps true of all organizations that a few employees will be treated favourably. In the McGill Normal School, most positions were given with some objectivity, but a few permitted special treatment.

Several factors determine who shall be favoured. The most obvious and the most common is the favouring of one's own family, which is of the very essence in a private concern but in public affairs is usually done with discretion.

Secondly there is a tendency to look for allies, so that a person may be singled out because for a variety of reasons, he has a set of characteristics which are particularly suitable.

Thirdly, and in a manner, superceding the first two groups of factors determining who shall be favoured, is the necessity of giving special rewards to those whose role is the immediate command of a particular organization. In the McGill Normal School, the Principal was the only link between the School and the University authorities who, with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, were ultimately responsible for its functioning. The latter needed a person who could effectively translate their objectives into daily actions, and who for this purpose required a detailed knowledge of the organization which they could not possibly master. The

position of Principal was the stronger because there was only one Protestant Normal School and also during the entire history of the School the Principal was unhampered by unions or any organized force from below as it were, which might have limited his powers. He was thus permitted to some extent to influence the appointments of those around him and to place near him, where possible, those who, he thought, could best help him or those whom he wanted most to help.

A favoured teacher was not necessarily working full time. Robins himself was a part time teacher, particularly at the time when Hicks was Principal; and when Robins became Principal, Elson I. Rexford accepted the invitation to deliver lectures on Education Law and The Obligations of the Teachers.[51] He was at that time English Secretary in the Department of Education, and he had also been a persistent critic of the School curriculum though now he became silent.

At the time of Robin's principalship the most favoured teacher was probably Lilian Robins who was appointed almost immediately after Robins became Principal, with a salary of $500.00, higher than Jane Sloane's salary of $375.00 and of Mary Peebles' of $375.00, both teachers of several years' standing, the latter becoming Headmistress of the Girls' Model School in 1893 and the former becoming Headmistress

---

[51] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. Cit., December 4, 1884, and December 15, 1884, pp. 99 and 100.

of the Primary Department in 1897. By January 1, 1885, Lilian Robins was receiving $600.00,[52] equal to the earnings of Lucy H. Derick, then Headmistress of the Primary Department, and well above the earnings of Mary Peebles and Jane Sloane who were receiving $450.00 each. By September 30, 1889, Lilian Robins was receiving $720.00, higher now than what Lucy Derick was receiving, still $600.00, while Mary Peebles and Jane Sloan were then getting $480.00, and even Madame Sophie Cornu, the first female Professor of the Normal School, was receiving $750.00.[53] Mary Peebles' salary did not reach $700.00 until April 3, 1893, when she became Headmistress, and even in 1900[54] the list of requested salary increases to be presented to H. Thomas Duffy by Dr. Peterson, showed that $700.00 was requested for the Headmistress of the Girls' Model School.

Lilian B. Robins also had prestigious positions and responsibilities. In the 1894-1895[55] school session, she is shown as giving Tutorial Aid together with Madame Cornu, Professor Kneeland, and Robins, and her official position was Assistant to the Principal and Instructor in Classics. In

---

[52]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Cash Book, January 31, 1885.

[53]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. Cit., p. 133.

[54]Ibid., May 11, 1900.

[55]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1894-1895, 1895-1896.

addition, she had a number of unique benefits. On November 13, 1889,[56] the attention of the Committee was directed to Lilian Robins' hours of attendance at the Normal School, and a decision was reached that in order to allow her to complete her two years' course of study at McGill University, her hours of attendance at the Normal School during that period were to be: Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 1-5 p.m.; Wednesdays and Fridays, 2-5 p.m. Thus for several years she had been receiving a salary which normally was given to teachers with certain academic qualifications which she was now being given special facilities to obtain.

---

[56] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., November 14, 1889.

3. Discriminating Against Members of the Staff

Several cases have been cited of employees who at one time or another in their careers, and especially toward the end, had been treated unjustly. James Cooper the janitor of the McGill Normal School, appears as an outstanding example of such treatment. The position of janitor is normally a hard and lonely one. It is often regarded as a rather lowly position and the duties of the janitor are seldom accurately defined so that it is quite possible for a conscientious janitor to work hard with little acknowledgement.

The janitor at the McGill Normal School was on his own, except when he hired help, for which he was given extra financial assistance after 1877.[57] He was responsible for the cleanliness of the school, minor repairs, and the maintenance of the electrical and heating systems. He had no colleagues like the teachers had, and it is also likely that he was treated as inferior. It is quite possible, therefore, that a person like James Cooper developed a certain truculence with time and also perhaps that he perfected

---

[57] Ibid., May 3, 1877.

a few short-cuts in his services. Nevertheless he was appointed in 1857, so that when he was finally put out of the school in 1887, it was after thirty years of "faithful services", as they are described in the Minute Book.[58] There is every reason to credit a person with having performed reasonably when he has kept a position so long and when at the end there is some expression of satisfaction on the part of the employer.

James Cooper appears to have had a salary of $360.00 until 1876 when the salary increases recommended to the Government on March 3, 1875, were implemented and his salary rose to $400.00. He complained in 1877 of having eight extra rooms and requested at least $12.00 a month to hire extra help. To this the Normal Committee agreed and at the meeting on June 6, 1877, he was requested to present an estimate of his extra work so that the Committee might decide whether they would be able to grant him a maximum of $12.00 extra. While Dawson and Hicks were Principals there does not appear to have been any criticism of James Cooper's services, and the Cash Book of January 1, 1885, shows him as still receiving his $400.00 after Robins had become Principal. However, shortly after, Robins became very critical.

---

[58] Ibid., September 7, 1887, p. 249.

On January 6, 1886,[59] he asserted that the janitor was very inefficient and unwilling to accept instruction, that he was persistently negligent and disobedient. The Secretary was instructed to express to James Cooper, the dissatisfaction of the Committee. Since James Cooper was now, in his twenty-ninth year of service, it is perhaps understandable that he would not take kindly to instruction from the new principal, and also that he would even be disobedient. In December 1886, a fire took place and Robins was convinced that it was due to the negligence of James Cooper. A letter was sent to him on December 24, 1886,[60] informing him that he would no longer receive the $12.00 per month because the cleaning was poor, and in a letter dated March 11, 1887, when James Cooper was in his thirtieth year of service, Robins wrote to the Superintendent of Public Instruction that James Cooper was "no good", and that because of age, he should be replaced. He recommended that James Cooper be dismissed with $200.00 or six months' salary, and an annual pension of $100.00. Since, however, James Cooper was by then, admittedly advanced in age, this fact might have been cited in his favour and not against him, and it might have served to soften the harshness implicit in the description

---

[59] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., January 6, 1886.

[60] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. Cit., December 24, 1886, p. 158.

"no good". Furthermore only the views of Robins are known. There is no record of James Cooper's version of these events.

On December 22, 1886, a letter was read from Robins where he elaborated on his views of James Cooper. He described him as quite unfit by natural disposition and advanced age. One wonders how James Cooper managed to keep the first disqualification a secret for so many years, and the second is hardly an offence. Robins accused him of not reporting a fire which nearly burned the building, and declared him a "totally incompetent incumbent". He repeated his determination not to renew the contract with James Cooper at the end of the session, and to recommend a replacement to the Government. This recommendation was to be presented by Robins and Dawson, the Chairman of the Normal Committee. Dawson, it may be noted, on this as on other occasions where a member of the staff who had completed his years of service, was receiving unjust treatment, remained silent.

On January 19, 1887,[61] a resolution was passed to request a successor to James Cooper, who was declared unfit, and as having to be replaced. On March 9, 1887,[62] a resolution from the Protestant Committee was read that in the event of the superannuation or retirement of the Janitor, appointments in

---

[61] Ibid., p. 225.

[62] Ibid., March 9, 1887.

the future would be on an annual basis. The Normal Committee resolved that James Cooper should leave after June 30, 1887, on account of "age and infirmity", with a retiring allowance of $100.00 per annum payable monthly, and that the Committee would appoint a successor from year to year.

This allowance, proposed by Robins seems generous, but on May 4, 1887,[63] a letter was read from Gédéon Ouimet, the Superintendent, who favoured a yearly agreement with future janitors but refused to accept a retiring allowance for James Cooper. Only the $200.00, or six-month salary was to be given. As it happened, even this was a long time coming. Though on August 12, James Cooper was notified by letter from I. McThane of the Bureau du Gouvernement, that he was dismissed and had "to leave the place" by August 31,[64] it was not till November 1887, that authorization was received to pay the $200.00 from the McGill Normal School share of the grant,[65] and the sum was actually paid after the Normal Committee Meeting of December 7.[66] Thus half a years' salary was the total pension after thirty years' service.

---

[63] Ibid., p. 237.

[64] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. cit., p. 247.

[65] Ibid., p. 260.

[66] Ibid., p. 267.

We do not know what James Cooper thought of the whole episode. There are, however, several references to later janitors which throw some light on what he might have thought. James Brown, for example, who was chosen to succeed James Cooper, was told in a letter to him by W.C. Baynes, the Normal Committee Secretary, that "implicit and prompt obedience" was expected of him,[67] and on January 8, 1898,[68] the Secretary was instructed to write to Aaron Maclean, successor to James Brown, that the Committee had learned of his disobedience to the instructions of the Principal with regard to managing the furnaces, and he was warned that such conduct would not be suffered. On January 9, 1902,[69] Robins complained against Aaron Maclean, that he did not keep the school sufficiently clean although he was paid enough, and that he did not receive complaints with respect although good temper should be "an essential qualification for a caretaker". He was warned that subsequent lack of attention would endanger his position. On the whole the impression is left that Robins was unduly harsh toward those least able to defend themselves.

---

[67] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. cit., p. 195.

[68] Ibid., p. 186.

[69] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. cit., p. 342.

C. ACTIVITIES OF THE STAFF

1. Teaching and Supervising

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, a full-time teacher at the McGill Normal School, had to spend about 49 hours a week on the premises, not counting preparation, or administrative and other responsibilities. Presumably this meant that most of the Normal School teachers had minimal time for extra-curricular activities, including reading. Ideally, this may be considered a serious disadvantage, although in fact it was the position of almost the entire population of the world. In recent years, leisure time has increased considerably and we may even reach a point where people will have to be paid to enjoy themselves.[70] It is now customary for teachers to spend several hours a week on activities other than teaching, and in many ways these contribute to a better understanding of the subject taught and of the person who is taught.

One great obstacle to the teacher's management of his or her time, during the years of the McGill Normal School was the lack of job definitions and this coupled to an ethic which insisted on the subordinate's working beyond the call of duty, made it difficult to find time for oneself. One criticism leveled against the Normal School curriculum by

---

[70] Pierre Berton, The Smug Minority, Toronto, Montreal: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1968, pp. 30-38.

Elson Rexford, for example, was the lack of time to supervise the teaching of the student teachers. There was a clear admission that time was lacking, but even if time could be found, and this could be done only by removing some teaching, then it seems that the suggestion was that this had to be transfered to some other type of teaching, the supervision of student teachers. On October 4, 1882,[71] Hicks was asked to enquire whether the advanced classes of the Model School could be taken away so that the Headmaster and Headmistress could spend more time supervising the Normal School students, and later, when the Academy Class was removed, one of the reasons given for this step was the extra time that teachers would have to supervise the student teachers at the Model Schools, or to take classes in Science, a subject which to that time was inadequately staffed.[72]

Apart from relieving absent or sick colleagues, teachers were also frequently asked to carry out surveys and inquiries which in later years were regarded as being more properly the responsibility of members of administrative staffs. When Miss Green, the Art Teacher, died in 1902, the Normal School Committee at the meeting on April 8, 1902, voted

---

[71]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. cit., October 4, 1882.

[72]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 637/411, Minutes of the Corporation Committee of McGill University, January 25, 1888.

to ask the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction to recommend the appointment by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, of Henry F. Armstrong, Assistant Professor of Freehand Drawing and Descriptive Geometry at McGill University. His salary was to be such as to enable him to discharge the additional duties of teacher of drawing for the Elementary Class of Teachers in Training. After the appointment was confirmed, the Honourable Superintendent of Education requested[73] that the Normal School Committee confer with Armstrong with regard to framing a carefully graded scheme for teaching drawing, appropriate for the first six years of a public school course.

The annual sessions at the Normal School were ten months, from September 1 to June 30, until a proposal was made on June 25, 1884, to shorten them to nine months. The extra time given to teachers was, however, not as much as appears since the first of the three summer months was to be devoted to attendance at the Teachers' Institutes.

It should be noted, however, that, as is natural in a situation where jobs are in short supply, many teachers, especially part time ones, were more anxious to increase rather than decrease their hours of work in order thus to increase their incomes. On April 6, 1887,[74] a suggestion

---

[73] Ibid., September 25, 1902, p. 371.

[74] Ibid., April 6, 1887, p. 236.

was introduced to reduce the number of days devoted to examinations so as to add ten days of lectures. On September 5, 1877,[75] a letter was read from Dr. Baker Edwards suggesting an extra chemistry course, for extra remuneration, of from one to one and a half hours per week, on Practical Chemistry, which Edwards believed would facilitate the introduction of instruction in Chemistry in the City schools. This suggestion was accepted by the Normal Committee on condition that an increased grant to the Normal School would be given, and an application was made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The hours spent on pupil care at the Normal School were too many to permit teachers the opportunity to have other interests or even to read beyond their immediate requirements. Their rights in this respect as in many others, were not protected, and it was always necessary to be on guard against erosion of their positions. That their positions were superior to those of almost all other teachers, meant that there was a constant demand for these positions as can be seen from applications for vacancies and this was an added anxiety caused by unusual competition.

---

[75] Ibid., September 5, 1877.

2. Extra-Curricular Interests

The extra-curricular activities of the Normal School staff, as mentioned, were limited both in intensity and variety. They included attendance at the Teachers' Institutes in June, starting from 1884; attending Teachers' Conventions; sharing in the activities of the Lower Canada Teachers' Association; taking part in student activities; taking a rare leave of absence, often quite short; and travelling a little during the summer holidays. Except for the last two activities, they were all closely connected with school work, and were controlled and narrow in their range. Yet there were people, including educators, who felt that the teacher should experience and understand more of life. This is frequently seen in the exhortations given to student-teachers on numerous occasions. In the closing exercises of 1894, for example, the Reverend J.B. Silcox commented on the "disgracefully" low pay of the teachers,[76] and urged those starting out, to be "ambitious", by which presumbaly he meant that they should aim at gaining better working conditions which would make it possible for them to broaden their knowledge and deepen their understanding. But it is precisely this which the established routine seemed to frustrate, and to such an extent that neither the rare and short leaves of absence, of the teachers, nor their

---

[76] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, op. cit., June 1, 1894.

participation in the activities of the various Institutes and Associations, nor the little travelling that they could afford, were sufficient to make a significant difference.

The Teachers' Institutes offered courses in the Science and Art of Education and on School Management.[77] It is interesting to contrast the frequent references to the "art of education" with the grim reality of enforced cramming and penury which in fact constituted the training for and practice of teaching, and which are not conducive to developing art. The Institutes were organized by the English Secretary of the Department of Public Instruction, who appointed Directors and who supervised the operation of the Institutes.[78] The Directors were responsible to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, and, assisted by the Professors of the McGill Normal School, determined who should be a member of the Institutes.[79] These were held in four centres, with an attendance of between 50 and 100 in each.[80] They were regarded as providing significant experiences and an important reason for ending the school sessions in May rather than in June was to enable the teachers to go there.

---

[77] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/10, Regulations of the Protestant Committee, Part IV, Article 113.

[78] Ibid., Article 114.

[79] Ibid., Articles 114 and 115.

[80] George Parmelee, op. cit., p. 488.

The expenses of the teachers from the Normal School were paid by the latter,[81] and the teachers were given certificates of attendance.[82] Short summer courses on the Science and Art of Education and on School Management, designed as refresher courses for primary and secondary teachers, were probably not quite as useful to the Normal School teacher who was immersed in, or at least in close contact with, such courses, all year. But they did serve to establish further contact with other teachers. Certificates of attendance perhaps encouraged attendance but they also introduced an element of regimentation.

The Lower Canada Teachers' Association, in which both Dawson and Hicks took great interest, and on whose executives both served at different times, was perhaps the most important of the organizations in which teachers participated. Throughout the fifty years of the life of the McGill Normal School, this Association gained in membership and became more prestigious, but it remained modest in its own perception of its role which was as set out in its original Rules and Regulations,[83] to "further education", and to devote a part of its

---

[81] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/10, Regulations, Op. Cit., Article 118.

[82] Ibid., Article 116.

[83] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/3. The Lower Canada Teachers' Association, Rules and Regulations, 1856, Article 1.

funds to the purchase of books.[84] The first of these two roles implied basically an interchange of ideas through discussion of methods and techniques, as suggested by several speakers at the Inauguration ceremonies of the McGill Normal School. An interchange of ideas, however, can only be as valuable as the ideas themselves that are interchanged. If these remain fairly stale then interchanging them will not provide the stimulus needed to galvanize necessary changes. The cause of education, for example, could scarcely be "furthered" without discussion of such problems as the working conditions of teachers, the purpose of education, or the nature of society. But there is no evidence that even the most basic of these issues to the teachers, that which concerned their working conditions, was discussed. It is almost as if the working conditions of teachers, were irrelevant both to the subjects taught and to the methods of teaching them.

The second of the two roles, that of devoting a part of the funds to the purchase of books, could hardly have generated a large sum. The main source of funds for the Association was the annual membership fee and this was 2/6d.[85] or sixty two and a half cents. Even if we multiply this by

---

[84] Ibid., Article 4.

[85] Ibid., Article 3.

500, we have a maximum of a little over $300.00, and the membership of the Association was probably much less. In 1884, Robins gave the number of McGill Normal School graduates who were teaching at the time, as 285.[86] This figure incidentally, is not much different from that given by Hicks in 1871, which was 230.[87] From a total annual revenue of at most $300.00, not much could have remained for the purchase of books.

Leaves of absence from the McGill Normal School, were without pay except occasionally for part of the expenses or for transportation or even as part payment in times of illness, and do not appear to have been given for the purpose of enabling teachers to improve their academic qualifications by undertaking formal studies, nor to give them time for major research. Almost all references to leaves of absence, suggest that the purpose was private either because the teacher was ill or to allow the teacher to carry out some personal obligation. There does, however, seem to have been some development in this respect during the fifty years of the School's history, for whereas at the beginning, leaves of absence were almost entirely for the reasons suggested above, at the turn of the century they were granted also to

---

[86] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., May 7, 1884.

[87] Ibid., December 6, 1871.

enable teachers to attend conferences or to examine briefly some aspect of an educational system elsewhere. Furthermore, leaves of absence in the earlier years appear also to have been more difficult to obtain. On October 2, 1879,[88] for example, Miss Derick's informal application for a leave of absence was presented whereby she requested to be permitted to stay away for the reminder of the session owing to illness. She was asked to present this request in writing, and it was at the Normal Committee meeting of November 5, 1879, that her request was accepted and her leave was granted without pay. On February 2, 1881, Miss Francis was granted one month's leave of absence, and on April 4, 1900, Madame B. Cornu was granted a two-week leave of absence, both for personal reasons. On January 10, 1900, Miss Chisholm was granted three weeks of leave to visit a Boston Kindergarten and was also given fifty dollars travelling expenses.[89] Also in May, 1903, Liliane Robins[90] was allowed to visit Normal Schools in the United States.

---

[88] Ibid., October 2, 1879.

[89] Ibid., January 10, 1900.

[90] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Letter Book, Op. Cit., January 31, 1903. p. 385.

3. Limitations on Activities Imposed by Financial Uncertainties

As already mentioned, financially, the Normal School teachers were better off than the primary and secondary school teachers. Their working conditions, especially compared to those of teachers in remote or outlying areas, were also better in that they were located in the Metropolis and had relatively easy access to means that could lead to further improvements. Above all, they taught a group of students who were earnest, well-behaved, and hard-working. Their students were highly motivated to succeed, and yet were at an academic level that did not demand much reading or research by the teachers. The Normal School students realized that neither their entrance into the Normal School, nor their stay there, could be taken for granted and this made the teachers' task as far as discipline and motivation were concerned, much more pleasant than was the case in other schools. Nevertheless the way of life of the Normal School teachers was restricted by various financial problems, including facing strong competition for their positions, and uncertainty of tenure.

First, there was no lack of applicants for teaching posts at the McGill Normal School and only exceptionnally well placed teachers were able to threaten resignation as a way of gaining their objectives. There were even times when a teacher took another teacher's job, without remuneration. When Peacock resigned as drill instructor in 1870, he was

replaced by Eldridge without pay.[91] When Robert M. Campbell sent his letter of resignation on August 5, 1881, it was accepted at the Normal Committee meeting of September 14, and two letters of application for the post had already been received by August 30, one from R. Smart and one from Lynn P. Leet, so that the latter was appointed at $400.00. When Leet himself, resigned the following year,[92] applications were received from Robert Bernie, who had a Model School Diploma and taught at Leeds Model School in Howick; Luther Gilman who had a Model School Diploma and taught in Lawrenceville; and John P. Stephen, who also had a Model School Diploma and two years' experience in teaching, the second at the McGill Normal School where he appeared very satisfied. John P. Stephens was appointed to this post with $400.00.

The ease with which teachers could be replaced gave additional power to the Normal Committee. On September 14, 1881, Dr. Baker Edwards' request to resume his classes in physics and chemistry was refused;[93] on June 7, 1882, requests for salary increases by Miss Shanks, Miss Peebles, and Miss Francis, were rejected;[94] on May 2, 1883, Miss

---

[91] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., August 2, 1870.

[92] Ibid., September 20, 1882.

[93] Ibid., September 14, 1881.

[94] Ibid., June 7, 1882.

Francis' resignation was accepted;[95] On April 6, 1903, Esther M. Smith's request for a salary increase was rejected,[96] while on June 6, 1903, her resignation was accepted.[97]

Second, a corollary to the ease with which resignations were accepted, and requests for improvements turned down, was the readiness to use the power of dismissal. This power was used with discretion, but to the Normal School teacher it was a worry. When Jane Sloan was reinstated as Headmistress of the Primary Department on April 6, 1903, she was informed that her services would no longer be required after June 30, of that year. Also J.R. Dougall, of The Witness office, a member of the Normal Committee, together with Robins were appointed as a Standing Committee to fill any vacancies in the Normal and Model Schools during the summer vacations, and Elson Rexford was appointed a sub-committee of one to consult with Kneeland concerning the teaching of physical geography in the Model School, and to inform Kneeland of the Normal Committee's desire that this be taught by a specialist, to intimate that this desire was not a reflection on his work, and after these interviews to contact Robins and Peterson. At that time the three of them were given the power to

---

[95] Ibid., May 2, 1883.

[96] McGill University Archives, Accession No.145, Letter Book, Op. Cit., pp. 405 and 415.

[97] Ibid., p. 400.

appoint Dr. Wilson, in the place of Kneeland if that were advisable.

There was also the problem of retirement. As already seen, even Hicks had grave problems over receiving his pension and eventually was given a small proportion of what he had expected. It is interesting to note that on June 8, 1883,[98] the Chairman reported that Senator Ferrier and he had recommended to the Government that in the event of a retiring allowance being given to the Principal in the future, this would not prejudice a greater allowance from the Pension Act or Civil Service Fund, and that such an allowance was not to be chargeable to the funds of the Normal School to any greater amount than that of the balance of the Model School fees. The expectations, apparently, even at that time, when Hicks' resignation was a certainty, were much greater than events warranted. When Davey sent his resignation in 1886,[99] he earnestly requested that his pension rights be clarified before the resignation was accepted, but he too was disappointed. Pension expectations of teachers appear to have been uncertain throughout this period and settlements were always much lower than the salaries indicated or even than the expectations of those concerned.

---

[98] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., June 8, 1883.

[99] Ibid., February 1.

Teachers, furthermore, had the constant worry of internal competition wondering when to apply for increases and how much to request. Jane Swallow writing on June 28, 1883, pointed out that she had not requested an increase for eight years, and during this period had taken no holidays. This indicates that the teachers were under more strain than might appear from a statistical statement of their time off duty, for officially Jane Swallow was entitled to two months of holiday in the summer and about three more weeks during the year, which evidently she was unable to take.

Obviously, the teachers of the McGill Normal and Model Schools had their own private interests and hobbies. Hicks, for example, was chess champion of Montreal, but on the whole they probably led rather quiet, hard-working, and sober lives, careful of the impression they created, and anxious about numerous problems, important among these, the financial ones.

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT ACTIVITIES

A. STUDENT CURRICULUM

1. Subjects

The subjects taught to the students of the McGill Normal School, are outlined in the Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, 1856.[1] There were fourteen subjects in the Senior Division - the art of teaching, history, geography, composition and declamation, intellectual and moral philosophy, drawing and music, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, chemistry, agriculture, natural history, French, and religious instruction; and sixteen subjects in the junior division. If, however, we separate intellectual from moral philosophy, and drawing from music, the number of subjects becomes sixteen, for the Senior Division, and eighteen for the Junior Division. The latter, in addition to the subjects taught in the Senior Division, also took grammar, reading and spelling, writing, and natural philosophy, but did not take chemistry, and composition-declamation. In both divisions the students also practice - taught in the Model School, the Senior Division for thirteen

---

[1] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, 1856, Article III Course of Studies, No. 10.

hours a week, and the Junior, for twelve hours.[2] The total hours that students were in teaching conditions, was forty two for the Senior Division and forty six for the junior. The following table shows the number of hours devoted to the various subjects.

TABLE 1

SUBJECTS AND NUMBER OF PERIODS PER WEEK 1857.

Subject	Number of Periods Per Week	
	Senior Division	Junior Division
Art of Teaching	1	1
History	2	2
Geography	2	2
Grammar	-	2
Composition/Declamation	2	-
Intellectual/Moral Philosophy	1	1
Reading/Spelling	-	2
Writing	-	2
Drawing/Music	2	2
Arithmetic	3	3
Algebra	2	2
Geometry	2	2
Natural Philosophy	-	2
Chemistry	1	-
Agriculture	2	2
Natural History	3	3
French	5	5
Religious Instruction	1	1
Practice-Teaching	13	12
	42	46

[2] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/3/1, Prospectus, op. cit., 1857, p. 3.

A major weakness of this curriculum would appear to lie in its lack of qualitative differentiation. The most elementary subjects such as reading, spelling, and writing are coupled with subjects that are considerably more advanced such as algebra, geometry or natural history, and even with subjects that are extremely advanced such as the art of teaching or intellectual and moral philosophy. The incongruity of this kind of juxtaposition of learning areas becomes more clear if for a moment we turn our attention to the demands on the time of the student. If we assume an equivalence in the time required for study to the time taken in class, which is little enough when we consider how long it might take a student to work out a geometric or algebraic problem, or how long it would take to study the material required in chemistry, history, geography or philosophy, then we have a student workload of roughly 80 to 90 hours a week or thirteen to fifteen hours each day of a six-day week. There is thus a prima facie case for arguing that the students did not in fact learn nearly as much as the curriculum indicated for with so many subjects, very little time or energy remained for thought and reading.

The difficulties for the student become even clearer as we look at the details that theoretically were required in the subjects. In history, for example, a general and particular knowledge was expected,[3]

---

[3] McGill University Archives, Accession Number 927/1/41, Rules and Regulations, Op. Cit., Article III, No. 10.

of sacred history, and the histories of Britain, France, and Canada. The Prospectus for 1857, gives even more detail.[4] At the end of the first year, the student is there portrayed as having gained a general knowledge of the histories of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, and the Jews; and a "minute" knowledge of Canadian history. By the end of the second year, the student was supposed in addition, to have acquired a knowledge of medieval and modern history, more detailed knowledge of the history of modern nations, particularly Britain, France, and the United States, as well as a history of modern Asia and America, the histories of literature, the sciences and art, the history of manufactures, colonization and commerce. He was furthermore, expected to be able to trace the influences that had produced and still affected the present state of society, and to narrate the events of the present century "as minutely as possible." This knowledge was to be gained by means of two periods of history per week or a total of roughly 140 hours over a two-year period, or if we were to put the time into one stretch, about three weeks, plus whatever study time the student was able to squeeze out of the little that was available.

In geography too, the students supposedly covered a vast area. In their first year, they were expected to learn the boundaries of cities and towns in Canada, the lengths and

---

[4]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, op. cit., 1857.

courses of rivers, the position and extent of lakes, thermal and hygrometric lines, atmospheric currents, geological structures, sectional contours, and the statistics of manufactures and commerce. By the end of the second year they had to be able to solve nautical problems, know the positions of all remarkable points throughout the world, the extent and population of towns, lengths of rivers, mountain chains, the distribution of heat and moisture, geological structure, currents of air and ocean, location of plants and animals, statistics of commerce, and be able to describe every ten degrees square on the earth. This knowledge was to be acquired within the same time that was allowed for history.

In contrast to subjects such as history and geography where the knowledge required was expressed in an overly ambitious manner, there were other subjects where the knowledge required was expressed in a manner that more accurately reflected attainable standards. By the end of the first year, for example, students were expected to read and spell well, to write intelligibly and with ease, and to construct plain English prose. The subjects that would help them achieve these skills were reading, spelling, writing, and grammar, each of which was given the exact amount of teaching time given to history and geography. But the fact that the three more simple subjects were more accurately defined only makes the claims for the other subjects more unrealistic because students who can scarcely read or write, will certainly find

impossible, studies which assume these basic skills and are still extremely difficult. Nevertheless, the curriculum remained essentially unchanged throughout the history of the Normal School, with a few modifications none of which took into account the necessity to limit the number of subjects and the area of knowledge within the subject, to that point where a student would have time to study and understand.

TABLE II

MCGILL NORMAL SCHOOL TIME TABLES 1873-1874[5]

Elementary Classes

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
9	Mod. Sch.	Arith.	Mod. Sch.	Arith.	Mod. Sch.	Drawing.
10	"	Alg/Geom.	"	Alg.	"	Eloc.
11	"	Art of T.	"	Geom.	"	Sing.
1	Geom.	Mod. Sch.	Geom.	Mod. Sch.	Gram.	
2	Hist.	"	Eng. Lit.	"	Hist.	
3	Comp.(3.30)	Eloc.	Fr. (3.30)	Eloc.	Writing	
4	Fr.	Phys/Chem.	Geol.	Relg.	Fr.	

Model Classes

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
9	Arith.	Mod. Sch.	Alg.	Mod. Sch.	Geom.	Eloc.
10	Latin	"	Lat.	"	Arith/Alg.	Drawing.
11						Sol Fa.
1	Mod. Sch.	Geog.		Ed.	Mod. Sch.	
2	"	Hist.	Fr.	Comp.	"	
3	(3.30) Alg.	Gram.	Eng. Lit.	Chem.	Fr.	
4				Relg.	Zool.	

Academy Classes.

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
9		Mod. Sch.		Mod. Sch.		Eloc.
10		Mor. Phil.		"		Drawing
11	Math.	Latin	Math.	"	Math.	Singing
1	Gk.	Geog.	Mod. Sch.	Gk.	Latin	
2		Hist.	"	Comp.	Mod. Sch.	
3	Fr.		Eng. Lit.	Mor. Phil.	"	
4			Fr.	Relig.	Zool.	

[5]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, 1873-1874.

The time-tables for 1873-1874, show the studies at the Elementary, Model and Academy classes. The lack of qualitative differentiation noted at the beginning of this chapter is clearly seen. Drawing and singing were included at all three levels, even at the Academy, side by side with Moral Philosophy, very extensive areas of History and Geography, Latin and Greek, Mathematics and the Sciences. Latin, which is not included in the Elementary class, is defined in the academy class,[6] presumably within two years of starting, as including a knowledge of Sallust, Catiline, Virgils' Aeneid Book IV, Latin prose, composition, and Roman History. Greek, which started in the Academy class, included within the year, the New Testament and Xenophon's Anabasis.

The second interesting characteristic of these time-tables is the time devoted to practice-teaching which was 14 hours for the Elementary classes, 11 hours for the Model Classes, and 9 hours for the Academy classes, per week. A closer look at two single days picked at random one each, from the Elementary and Academy classes, reveals the following. On Mondays, the Elementary class students spent the morning from 9 a.m. to noon with classes of the Model School, perhaps singing with the children, or dancing, or drawing. There was also presumably some academic teaching and even correcting. Whether the students were with very young children or slightly

---

[6] Ibid., 1873-1874.

older ones, whether listening to Model and Normal school teachers or teaching themselves, some preparation was necessary for these classes. At one o'clock, after a somewhat hurried meal, the students went to their own classes of Geography, History, Composition and French which finished at 5 p.m. That evening, assuming rapid, efficient work, roughly five hours' preparation had to be done for Tuesday's Elementary Classes where they were the students, plus preparation for the Model School classes where they practice-taught. If this amount of preparation was not done, then it is difficult to believe that the Normal School student could achieve the standards that the guide-lines professed. Yet it is probable that much less time must really have been spent in preparation.

The academy class time-table shows more "spares" but the number of subjects is still so great that the same problems of finding time for preparation, and therefore of actually reaching set standards, faced the student at this level. On a Thursday with a schedule corresponding almost exactly with the one just mentioned of the Elementary class, the Academy student ending the Thursday with a class on religion at 5 p.m., had to prepare for three Academy Classes and two hours at the Model School on Friday.

If we presume that the most important aspects of the art of teaching include a sound knowledge of the subject taught, the ability to express oneself, and the ability to judge whether what is said is understood, one wonders how many hours of practice-teaching are required to instill such knowledge

and such abilities. The first is almost entirely independent of practice-teaching and is a part of academic learning. The other two also probably require relatively little practice-teaching. Yet the first requisite must have been extremely hard for the Normal School student whose qualification on entering the Elementary classes were the ability to "read and write tolerably well," and to know the "rudiments of grammar," and who therefore must have lacked a sound knowledge of the subject.[7] It would appear that the Elementary class would have benefitted much more from scarcely any practice-teaching, and that even the Academy class should have had much less. Yet, Elson Rexford insisted that there was not enough practice-teaching.

Teaching indeed, is almost inseparable from the subject taught. There is no such thing as abstract teaching and there are probably transferable techniques only within narrow limits. A person who understands a subject and is reasonably articulate, will learn methods of imparting a knowledge of that subject, but a person who does not understand a subject will soon also lose interest in the method of teaching it. We may assume therefore, that there was limited gain to the Elementary Class student in spending hours, learning how to teach dancing, singing, and drawing to little children. Hours spent listening to and watching the teaching of history likewise, probably gave limited gain since the student had such scant knowledge of the subject, and it seems that it would have been more profitable to make sure the student-teacher knew the subject well.

---

[7] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 92-/1/41, Rules and Regulations, op. cit., Article 16.

2. Examinations and Diplomas

At the beginning, in 1857, the McGill Normal School was divided into two classes, the Junior Division and the Senior Division,[8] also known as the Elementary and Model Classes. In 1865, the Academy Class was added and in 1897, a kindergarten class.[9] The following year, 1898, classes were further refined to include an Advanced Elementary Class, a nine-month course;[10] a special Elementary, four-month course for rural teachers;[11] and a class in Pedagogy. In 1888,[12] the Academy Class, as such, was closed, but prior to this, many efforts were made to define the nature of this class in attempting to relate the Normal School programme to that of the University.

On September 20, 1882, it was decided to grant two levels of Academy diplomas, a First Class Academy Diploma and an Academy Diploma, the former to be presented to both men and women, like the latter, but on different criteria.[13] Male students with Academy diplomas from the McGill Normal School, would be entitled to a First Class Academy Diploma after their

---

[8] Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1857 p. 3.

[9] Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1897-1898.

[10] Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1898-1899.

[11] John Adams, Op. Cit., p. 35.

[12] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., February 1, 1888.

[13] Ibid., September 20, 1882.

second year at the University, and female students would be entitled to the same diploma when they passed the university examination of Senior Associate in Arts, including examinations in Greek and Latin, English Language and English Literature. This decision was adopted and sent to the Corporation of the University with the recommendation of the Normal Committee that it be accepted. By June 8, 1883, the resolution, in amended form, was sent by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, to the Governor for confirmation in the form of Regulations. A First Class Academy Diploma was to be given to graduates of Arts from British or Canadian Universities, who had passed in Latin or Greek and in the Art of Teaching at the McGill Normal School. A Second Class Academy Diploma was to be given to candidates who had taken the Academy Diploma at the McGill Normal School or at the Board of Examiners, and who had passed the Intermediate or Second Year's examinations of a university in Quebec, or if a female, the examinations for Senior Associate in Arts, including Latin and Greek. The Second Class Academy Diploma, thus corresponded to the Normal Committee's resolution of the previous year for a First Class Academy Diploma. A Third Class Academy Diploma was to be given to those who passed the Academy examinations of the McGill Normal School, or those of the Boards of Examiners.

The authority of the latter, however, had been attacked on several occasions. As early as May 6, 1873, at the Normal Committee meeting, Hicks had reported on the inconvenience and abuse of the Examinations of Persons for the School Diploma, by the Boards of School Examiners, and at the Normal Committee meeting on January 7, 1885, a resolution was passed that it was not in the interests of higher education that local Boards of Examiners should have the power to examine Candidates for the Academy Diploma. Local Boards of School Examiners were in fact replaced by a Central Board of Examiners, by 1899.[14]

On July 9, 1883, the resolutions mentioned above, concerning the Academy Diploma were sanctioned by the Government.[15] It should be noted that women were barred from a First Class Academy Diploma by the new regulations, since at that time the University courses were not open to them.

In any case, this arrangement does not appear to have been satisfactory and the years 1883 and 1884, saw a flurry of activity both in re-defining the relationship of the Academy class to the University and in changing the opportunities for higher education, afforded to women. On December 3, 1884, Robins and McGregor recommended to the Normal Committee, that the Academy Diploma be considered equivalent to the first year of the Bachelor of Arts course, and that students with marks above a certain standard be given free tuition.

---

[14]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1899-1900, p. 22.

[15]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minute Book, Op. Cit., July 9, 1883.

A formal resolution to this effect was passed on January 7, 1885, and the approval of the Faculty of Arts to this was noted on April 1, 1885.

Meantime at the meeting of the Corporation Committee of McGill University in October, 1884,[16] Dawson presented his report on the Higher Education of Women and submitted a plan for carrying out the objects intended, by the endowment of the Honourable Donald A. Smith for women's education. He estimated that the income of the endowment would be sufficient for the educational work of the first and second years in Arts, providing no expense had to be incurred for rooms or buildings. The following arrangements were decided for the first year and preparations were also made for succeeding years. First, classes were to be opened for women under the Donald A. Smith endowment, to replace the special course in the Faculty of Arts which had been created by Chapter 7, Section 6, of the Statutes. Second, the Faculty was to be requested to prepare regulations and make arrangements for these special courses, reporting to the Corporation, and with power immediately to begin the classes for women for the first year's work in the Faculty of Arts. Third, the Faculty was authorized to admit to the Matriculation Examination, women over sixteen, who would present themselves,

---

[16] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 929/2/11, Minute Book of the Meetings of the Corporation of McGill University, October, 1884.

and to admit as partial students in the classes for women, any who could proceed with the classes in the hope of making good their standing at a later date. Fourth, with the permission of the Board of Governors, the professors and lecturers were to be the instructors for the special courses, as far as possible, and the Board of Governors was to be requested to grant permission for this purpose and to provide assistance that might be required. The principal of the University was authorized to confer with the executive Committee of the Ladies Association concerning co-operation, reporting to the Corporation, but with power to make temporary arrangements with the approval of the Faculty of Arts. The McGill Normal School was to be requested to consider how the students of the Normal School could best use these classes for women and to report on the subject if necessary. The Principal of the University was authorized with the consent of the Board of Governors to procure the necessary class rooms for such of the classes for women as could not conveniently be accommodated in the college building.

The Faculty of Arts promptly and unanimously issued an announcement stating the subjects of the matriculation and study for the first year, and informing the public that a course for the second year was to be announced for the session of 1885-1886. For the third and fourth years, it was "expected" that the Corporation would be able to provide courses, separate or mixed. In the Peter Redpath museum, where the classes were adequate, courses had already started with fourteen undergraduates and partial students, and thirteen occasional students. The new classes had encouraged the Board of Governors to appoint a long-needed assistant to the Professor of Classics and to invite lecturers from English universities.[17] The Faculty of Science had started the same way, and the special courses in the Faculty of Arts came at once under the operation of all the machinery of the Faculty. That session and the next could be completed without touching any of the general revenue of the University. The salary of the assistant in Classics was to be shared with the Donald A. Smith endowment.

The personal opinion of Dawson was that the culture of women should be higher, more refined, better suited for their natures than that which was provided for men, and therefore had to be separate.[18]

---

[17] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 929A/2/12, December 6, 1884, p. 5.

[18] Ibid., p. 12.

On January 25, 1888,[19] Dawson reported from the Normal Committee meeting, that the Academy class would close, because the need for which this class was intended could now be better met at the University since it had always been specially literary and non-professional, and had never had a large number of students. Opportunities for literary training were now appearing for women as well as for men in the University. The Normal School Committee requested permission to suggest the following regulations for the approval of the Corporation and of the Department of Public Instruction, and the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction. First, that selected students be permitted, at the end of the Model School year, to take the examinations for entrance into the first year of the Faculty of Arts of the University being examined either at the examinations for the Associates in Arts in June, or at those for the Matriculation in Autumn, and that these students take the full course of study in the first and second years. Second, that such students enroll in the McGill Normal School as Academy class students pledged to teach for three years, and engaging in practice teaching, the times and schools to be arranged by the Principal of the Normal School, under his supervision and conforming to the regulations of that school. Third, on receiving the report

---

[19] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 637/4A, Corporation Minute Book. Op. Cit., January 25, 1888.

from the University of the Christmas and Sessional examinations, the students would be entitled to bursaries not exceeding $30.00 per session in aid of fees and board. The bursaries could be paid by the Normal School Committee out of funds available for this purpose. Fourth, on passing the Intermediate or equivalent examination, students were entitled to receive the Academy Diploma in accordance with the Regulations of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction. Fifth, such students, with the advice of the Principal, might attend classes at McGill or its affiliated Colleges or at Bishop's College, and the Normal School Committee would make such arrangements as might be possible, for free tuition at such colleges. Sixth, the Principal would provide tutorial assistance and select the studies required by the curriculum of the Normal School. Seventh, students who had taken the Academy Diploma in this way, could continue for two years longer at the University or return after teaching, for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, but they had to fulfill their obligation to teach and not do any other business. The Principal moved that this resolution be adopted and transmitted to the Superintendent and to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction.

The Prospectus of 1895-1896[20] stated that a First Class Academy Diploma could also be awarded to a teacher

---

[20] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, Op. Cit., 1895-1896, p. 12.

holding the Academy Diploma before July 1, 1886 or the Second Class Academy Diploma under the new regulations, after ten years of satisfactory teaching when recommended by the Normal Committee.

On February 4, 1891, a course in Pedagogy consisting of forty lectures, was presented by Robins to the Normal Committee. The headings and sub-headings of the topics of this course indicate a somewhat arbitrary assessment of the nature of the knowledge that was to be imparted and also a somewhat exaggerated expectation of the usefulness of such knowledge. Some lectures were on topics subject to widely varied interpretation, Good Manners, Earnestness, Philanthropy, or Patriotism. Another series of topics would appear to be useful to only a portion of the teachers each time, for example, Botany or Chemistry. Another series of topics, presumably at a more advanced level, must again have appeared either too elementary or too complex, depending on the background of the listener. The five lectures on Physical and the ten on Mental Characteristics, dealing with the Training of the Eye, or the Ear, or with Health, presumably were elementary to the specialists in biology, and those on Understanding, Judgement or Reason must have appeared too complex to all but those whose interests were philosophy or perhaps religion.

B. ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS AND DISCIPLINE

1. Attendance Requirements.

The attendance and entrance requirements at the McGill Normal School are set out in the General Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, 1856.[21] Entrance requirements were not demanding with respect to academic standards but were fairly stringent in other respects. Once a student was accepted, academic levels had to be strictly maintained in addition to other requirements, and since the starting level was quite low, and the curriculum diffuse, the problem of completing the course became correspondingly more complex.

Entrance requirements seemed to emphasize a socially acceptable background. The age of the candidate had to be sixteen at the minimum,[22] for the Elementary class and seventeen for the Model, and these indeed became the usual ages of students entering the McGill Normal School. The candidate had to be a person of good morals, as defined and stated by the curate or minister in a certificate,[23] and a British subject.[24] The application had to be signed by two

---

[21] McGill University Archives. Accession No. 927/1/41. General Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, 1856, also Journal of Education (Quebec), Vol. 1, NO. 1, January, 1857, p. 27.

[22] Ibid., Section V, Article 16.

[23] Ibid., Section V, Article 16.

[24] McGill University, Archives. Accession No.927/1/10. Regulations of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, Section IV Article 95.

witnesses, and had to include the declaration required by article 23,[25] by which the candidate promised to teach for at least three years after graduation. All these certificates, forms and statements had to be examined by the Principal of the McGill Normal School, or his delegate, and when all this was complete together with the academic assessment, the entire application portfolio was forwarded to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, after which the name of the candidate was inscribed in the Register and notice was sent to the Principal of the McGill Normal School.

The academic qualifications are stated[26] as including the ability to read, to write, to know the rudiments of grammar, arithmetic to the rule of three, and some geography.[27] These qualifications are reiterated in the Normal School Prospectus of 1873-1874, where there is a statement within article 15, that entrance requirements could in the future, include additional stipulations.

Entrance examinations took place at the beginning of the session, although individuals were permitted to write them upto the end of the first term at Christmas. However, anyone writing after October could not take any part of the

---

[25] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, Section I, Article 23.

[26] Ibid., Section V, Article 15.

[27] Ibid., Section III, Article 10.

bursary fund which was distributed at Christmas.[28]

Students could be denied the privilege of attending the McGill Normal School if they failed to pass an examination, or for improper behaviour such as drunkenness,[29] or because a professor excluded them from a course of study.[30]

---

[28] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/10, Op. Cit., Article 99.

[29] Ibid., Article 100.

[30] Ibid., Article 101.

2. Rules and Regulations.

The behaviour and activities of the students at the McGill Normal School were controlled in several ways. First, the entrance requirements limited the number to those who were acceptable from the point of view of moral outlook, religion, ethnic origin, and education. This at once assured the authorities of the school, of a more manageable student body, one which, furthermore, could be moulded according to their preferences, and guided eventually to teach according to their traditions and perceptions. Second, once the student was accepted, there were other restrictions. Important among these was the necessity to work hard in order to pass the mid-session and end-of-session examinations and the threat of expulsion from the School if they failed to do this.

Important also were a series of controls over the places and conditions of residence. Those students who were not staying with their parents, had to stay in approved boarding houses,[31] selected by the Principal.[32] The address was to be stated by the student,[33] and only students of the same sex could stay in any one boarding house. If parents chose a place of residence for the students, this choice had to be

---

[31] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, op. cit., Section V., Article 18.

[32] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, op. cit., 1857.

[33] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, op. cit., Section II, Article 3.

approved,[34] and all changes of address had to be made known immediately.[35] Furthermore, all places of residence were subject to a monthly inspection by the Professors of the McGill Normal School.[36] Copies of these regulations were given to all boarding houses,[37] and the owners of the boarding houses were instructed to report all infringements.[38] All sicknesses were to be referred at once to the school, and special visits from the school authorities were to be made.[39]

A list of approved boarding houses for lady students in 1891, shows that board as well as lodging was provided.[40] Presumably ladies were not permitted, as were the men, to take their meals at taverns, restaurants, or clubs.[41] Ladies' and Mens' houses were often on the same street and charged within the same price range, from $2.50 to $4.50 per week. The prices charged were with the approval of the Principal of the McGill Normal School, and had to be allowed also by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.[42] So important

---

[34]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/10, op. cit., Article 104e.

[35]Ibid., Article 104f.

[36]Ibid., Article 104g.

[37]Ibid., Article 104d.

[38]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, op. cit., 185, By-laws January 20, 1857, Article 5.

[39]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/10, op. cit., Articles 104h and 104i.

[40]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 267/10, Scrapbook pp. 130-131.

[41]Ibid., pp. 130-131.

[42]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, op. cit., Section V, Article 18.

was the question of the residence of the students that a Director of Boarding Houses was appointed by the Superintendent with the approval of the Governor-General,[43] who was paid from the purse of the pupil teachers, by the Superindendent.[44]

The Act of 1856 which defined the status of the Normal Schools, allowed $333.33 annually for students' travelling expenses,[45] especially for those living over 90 miles away, who were allowed a maximum of $10.00 each,[46] paid quarterly. Up to $36.00 each were also given to help pay the board.[47]

Several regulations and bye-laws governed the activities of the students. They were not permitted in taverns, in disorderly houses, or gambling dens, nor to get drunk, nor to associate with persons of bad character, nor to perform acts of immorality or insubordination, upon pain of expulsion.[48] Students were permitted to attend lectures and public meetings only with the approval of the principal,[49] and and had to be in by 9.30 p.m.[50] No social intercourse was permitted

---

[43] Ibid., Section V, Article 27.

[44] Ibid., Section V, Article 26.

[45] Ibid., Section II, Article 6.

[46] Ibid., Section II, Article 5.

[47] Ibid., Section II, Article 4.

[48] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/41, op. cit., Section V, Article 17.

[49] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Prospectus, op. cit., 1857, By-laws, January 20, 1857.

[50] Ibid., Article 3.

between males and females, and visits were prohibited.[51] Professors were authorized to exclude students from their lectures for breaking rules or regulations.[52]

Students were expected to attend places of worship but were allowed to go to their own churches,[53] and they also had to attend religious instruction classes at 4.00 p.m. on Thursday afternoons.[54]

Expulsion from the McGill Normal School meant that the contract between the student and the school was at an end and no diploma or grant could be given.[55] But the contract was not considered broken if the student could not find employment after graduation.

The duties required by the curriculum, and the restrictions that applied to extra-curricular activities, indicate that the McGill Normal School corresponded more closely to a secondary school than to a University, so that students graduating from there, although better equipped to teach than most other primary and secondary school teachers of the time, as is widely claimed, may be judged by more universal standards to have been quite limited both in their knowledge

---

[51] Ibid., Article 7.

[52] Ibid., Article 6.

[53] McGill University Archives, Accession 927/1/41, op. cit., Section II, Article 9.

[54] Ibid., Article 7.

[55] Ibid., Article 24.

and outlook for there were several incongruities in the curriculum, as discussed earlier, and too little time, because of the great number of subjects, to read even to the stated standards of the school. There appears further to have been little in the extra-curricular activities, which are discussed in more detail in the next section, that could have contributed significantly to the intellectual or moral development of the students. Like other Normal Schools, the McGill Normal School tended to be an instrument of socialization designed to produce disciplined and pliant teachers to guide future generations along acceptable paths.

C. EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

1. Clubs and Societies

The academic curriculum of the McGill Normal School Students took up so many hours of each day that little time or inclination seemed to remain for other activities. This made it difficult for clubs and societies to flourish. Further the McGill Normal School students were not necessarily the most able academic students. They were young in age, and they were restricted in their opportunities and outlook. It is not surprising, therefore that extra-curricular activities were rather limited. There is no evidence that there were organized sports and occasional records tell only of literary and debating groups, and of some activity in connection with the Teachers' Association.

The records of clubs and associations are rather incomplete. However, from such records as there are, it is possible to some extent to form an opinion of the characteristics of these organized group activities.

First, the students who organized them and took active and leading roles in their maintenance, seem to have been dedicated and hard-working. The Normal School Literary Association, mentioned in Chapter II, held meetings almost every week during the school sessions, from late September to April or May, except during examinations and for a period of about two weeks before the start of the examinations.

Each meeting demanded planning and preparation for the activity concerned. There is evidence that there was great strain on the students and frequent changes of officers. On January, 13, 1863,[56] there was a debate as to whether public meetings could continue since membership had declined so much. Complaints concerning lack of attendance were frequent and early resignations for one reason or another, took place from time to time.

A second characteristic of these associations was, naturally enough, their immaturity, and this was apparent in a number of ways, particularly in the manner of conducting affairs as discussed in Chapter II, and also in the content of what was read or debated, which can be gauged from comments by various people on proceedings. The activities of the Literary Association were mainly the reading of essays, poems, or other literature. At the end of each annual session, the public meeting was rather like an exhibition or performance, which perhaps served as a public relations service to the School. At these public meetings, there were talks, readings, and other demonstrations of abilities and talents such as musical recitals, dances and songs. Dawson speaking at one of these[57] expressed himself as happy at the display of patriotic feeling, evidenced in part by the flags of Britain,

---

[56] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minutes of the McGill Normal School Literary Association, January 13, 1863.

[57] Montreal Gazette, April 1870.

France, and the United States.

At the weekly meetings the readings included original essays or poems, occasionally in French, or extracts from the writings of well-known authors. The original essays or poems varied from expressions of personal feelings, to discussions of current issues, and included phantasies, historical studies, biographies, philosophy, and general observations. Judging from their titles and even from the immediate comments of the recording secretaries, they are impressive, although the occasional more critical analysis does not seem to give them quite such a high rating. On March 14, 1859, Miss Chalmers read an essay on "Patience and Perseverance," and we are told that she "plainly proved" the necessity of these two qualities in all our undertakings. On October 24, 1859, Miss Trenholm read on "Great Purposes", and we are told that the essayist persuaded the members that when "her great purpose" was chosen, she would persevere in it until it was accomplished. Such comments suggest that the writings were rather over rated. On occasion, however, adverse comments appear. On October 22, 1868, the President expressed regret that any person should "so far forget" the nature of the weekly meetings, and the objects of the Association as to place in the hands of the secretary any paper with

the intention of "conveying the idea of its originality" when the writing was really the work of someone else. This suggests that plagiarism was not uncommon as the President is not likely to have made a public remark of this nature had there been only isolated cases. On November 11, 1868, the President complained that essays tended to be too similar to each other and superficial in their thinking, that not nearly enough care or study characterized the majority. On January 17, 1870, the Principal stated that he found the essays from the Anonymous Contributions, better than the previous contributions, and he hoped the interest would continue. This again suggests that contributions in general were not high quality.

Some of the essays were expressions of personal thoughts and tended to be moralistic, such as Miss Clarke's paper on "Our Aim in Life", read on March 21, 1859, or Miss Derick's on "Sunbeams and Shadows in Life", read on March 28, 1859; or Miss Lloyd's on "Charity", read on May 9, 1859. Others were on current issues, such as Miss Trenholm's on "Female Education" read on April 2, 1860, or "Canada" read by Miss Gill on February 13, 1860, or "Stray Leaves from the Life of a Student", by an anonymous author, read on December 3, 1868.

Phantasy essays included, "One Day's Experience in the life of an Exquisite", author unknown, read on March 21, 1859, or Miss London's "Autobiography of a Ring", read on February 27, 1860. There are also references to readings concerning Alexander the Great, January 21 and 28, 1861; Lord Byron, October 17, 1859; and other readings concerning history or biography. On May 16, 1859, Miss Roach read a "Dissertation on the Association of Ideas", presumably a philosophic study. In addition to the original writings there are references to readings from the Bible[58] and from the works of Milton, Emerson, Goldsmith, Byron, and Edgar Allan Poe. There is also some evidence of religious emphasis for meetings opened and closed with readings from the Bible and prayers.

Humility is a third characteristic of the members of the Association. This is seen in such practices as surrender the minute books to members of the Staff at the end of each session. In the 1863 to 1864 school session, no meetings were held until the 19th of January, because the students were, for some reason, unable to obtain the minute book from the

---

[58] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Minutes, Literary Association, op. cit., Meeting October 1868.

professor who had it.[59]

Fourth in spite of the austerity of the rules, and the somewhat solemn atmosphere that prevailed, there are several references to lighter and more rebellious actions. The fact that there were frequent complaints concerning the lack of attendance is evidence of a less serious side of the activities, and there are examples of writings that were not prepared at all. On January 12, 1868, neither Miss Craig nor Miss Rexford brought their essays and on December 1, 1868, the essayists were reported as absent. At this meeting too, we are told that during the reading of one piece, a laugh from one of the young ladies, "spoilt the effect of a beautiful sentiment", and the members had to be told to be more respectful. On October 24, 1869, the secretary had to be "severely reprimanded" by the Editress, Miss Craig, for her "previous conduct". On February 16, 1869, we read that members tended to rush to the door as soon as the meeting was adjourned, and that some members even anticipated the end, and left before the meeting was over. Also suggestions that teachers be allowed to join, made on October 7, 1874, were rejected and coming in late for meetings was sufficiently common that on September 30, 1874, it was suggested, although not accepted, that a fine of 5¢ be imposed for every three minutes of being late.

---

[59] Ibid., January 17, 1864.

The activities of the Literary Association were not limited to the weekly meetings, but included the publication of some sort of newspaper or perhaps sheet. There does not seem to be any existing copy of any newspaper but between the records of the meeting of January 27, 1863, and the meeting of April 14, 1863, there is a summary concerning regular meetings between these two dates and a reference to a public meeting where a paper called Wreath was discussed, and a proposal made that a second paper should be added.

The Normal School Literary Association appears to have been one of the more successful of the extra-curricular organizations, and it was entirely female from the evidence of the records. Predominantly, or entirely male associations, encountered greater problems because of the very few male students. The McGill Normal School Mutual Improvement Society was founded in January 1873 and there are a few records of its activities to May 22 of the same year. Presumbaly this Association ended at that time. In many ways it had the same characteristics as the Literary Association. It seems to have set out with unlimited ambitions. Article 2 of its constitution stated that it was formed for the moral, social and intellectual improvement of its members and in order to enlist their energies in the work of education. It started with sixteen members and Article 3, stated that present and past members of the McGill Normal School could be members. The immaturity of the founders is brought out in such

characteristics as over-ambition and overly complicated stipulations as in Article 2 of the bye-laws that new officers be appointed each month and retiring officers give reports.

The Association had frequent debates, although unfortunately, only one motion is actually recorded, and that in the form of a question. On January 18, 1873, the debate was on the question — Does the Platform Exert more Influence on Society than the Press? If this motion is any indication, it shows perhaps that the men were more interested in issues of the day than the women were. At the meeting of February 14, 1873, we read that a rule was introduced that no member could speak more than twice in a debate from which we may infer that discussions were quite lively. Unfortunately records concerning this Association are very scanty. None of the March meetings was recorded although dates are given, and none of the May meetings are recorded although they appear to have been held weekly till May 22.

The McGill Normal School Literary and Debating Club was founded in 1868, and again records are very scanty, going to January 31, 1880, with large gaps where only dates of meetings are given. This too appears to have been a Club for men, and its meetings were originally scheduled for 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays which would appear to be a most

unfortunate choice of time. It started with 15 members on February 14, 1878, with temporary officers and it was not until September 14 of the same year, that the bye-laws were prepared by a Committee of Three. The Club debated several motions in 1878 and 1879, including, "That Champlain did more for Canada than Frontenac", September 28, 1878. On this occasion, Mr. Browne led the affirmative side, and Mr. Scott, the negative. A jury of three men, one of them the foreman, took eight minutes to reach a decision.

On October 5, it was decided to have debates every two weeks, with essays in between. At that meeting there was some difficulty framing the motion for the next debate. A suggestion was that, "Wealth exerts a greater influence than talent". This was a modification from a suggestion made on September 28, that "Wealth has done more than Talent," but neither suggestion was accepted, and the matter was referred to the leaders on both sides. Unfortunately we have no record of the final result. Other motions debated included, "The Influence of the Modern Stage is for Good rather than for Evil", on November 9, and "The United States is destined to become the Mightiest of Nations", January 18, 1880. At the first of these two debates eight members and two visitors were present, and at the second, there were eleven members.

On April 26, 1879, we read only that the meetings were adjourned "sine die", and the final entry on January 31, 1880, mentions a dance.

2. Way of Life

Life for the student at the McGill Normal School consisted almost entirely of study. Not so much creative study in the sense that the student had freedom to read, think, and write at her or his own pace within the range of a subject, and interspersed with discussion, but rather a cramming of somewhat heterogeneous knowledge, presented without sufficient selectivity and without regard for the inclinations or talents of the students. The nature of the curriculum shows that study took place in the early evening, presumably when the faculties of mind and body are somewhat tired after the days' work, and presumably there were three or four subjects to be studied each evening. Thus if one hour only were devoted to each subject, it would be ten o'clock before the subjects were prepared. But this timetable can be kept only by the tightest discipline and good fortune. An unexpected problem, a few words with a friend, a short walk after supper, a letter home, and it could well have been past midnight before the studies were over. Furthermore to shift from one subject to another at the stroke of a clock is somewhat jarring to thought and it is reasonable to assume also that a student who becomes interested in a subject such as history, will find that little can be accomplished in an hour, and he will transfer to another subject with some sense of frustration.

Several references have been made to the overloaded curriculum of the McGill Normal School students, and to the

fact that little time or energy was left for outside activity or even for relaxation. Reference has also been made to the readiness with which students adapted to their ascetic regimen mainly because they had no choice. These conditions of life at the Normal School remained unmodified throughout its history. The students of the McGill Normal School lived very much confined to the school and its curriculum, so that their knowledge of the city and their opportunities to meet people, outside the school, were almost nil. Even their week-ends consisted of just Saturday afternoons, since on Sundays they were expected to attend two or more Church services.

The correspondence available does not refer to outings and entertainment. A letter from Dawson to Robins in the 1890's,[64] mentions tickets available for a university lecture to students wishing to attend. Dawson believed that the subject would interest them and he wrote that Dr. Harrington and Mr. Evans proposed to show the students the laboratories after the lecture. Each ticket would admit any number of students going together, and if they went early, it might have been possible to secure good seats for them. The tone of the letter suggests that this was considered a rather exciting adventure for the students.

---

[64] McGill University Archives. Accession Number 267/40.

The extent to which the students' time was officially taken up, can also be judged from various discussions concerning punctuality and holidays.

On June 2, 1893, it was suggested at a staff meeting that prizes should be given for punctuality, and the criterion for the prize was to be a maximum number of five lates and absences in a school year. A regularity prize was to be given to each student who had not been absent even for half a day, and monthly half holidays were to be given to those who had not been late even once, during the preceding month. Furthermore any student to whom a half holiday had not been given, who absented herself or himself during this half holiday, was to forfeit all prizes for that year, unless three hours of set work, with the consent of the principal, were performed, the student remaining voluntarily at the convenience of the teacher. Thus at best the student could not hope for more than one afternoon a month of free time, in addition to the weekly Saturday afternoon and evening. This shows the importance attached to attendance, and reveals the readiness of the students to comply, a readiness which surprises, when the prizes themselves are considered, which were quite meagre compared to the sacrifices demanded.

The unbending adherence to punctuality is also seen from a letter read at the Normal School Committee meeting on October 5, 1892, from R. Hewton concerning his sister

Clara Isabel Hewton. It appeared that the most convenient train from Lachine reached Montreal at 8.55 a.m. and this enabled Clara to reach the school punctually, but by the time she was upstairs, she was necessarily three to five minutes late. The only earlier train, however, reached Montreal two hours earlier, so that she would have to wait in the railway station for two hours. Mr. Hewton requested permission for Clara to arrive five minutes late. This was refused.

The restrictions in time added to the restrictions of movement explicit in several of the regulations governing the conduct of the students, would indicate that the students of the McGill Normal School were essentially boarders whose experience of life was confined to what they learned at school.

Another important aspect of life at the McGill Normal School was the great disparity between the numbers of women and men, which has already been mentioned. There has been a tendency to overlook the importance of this. In 1858,[65] there were forty graduates, thirty eight were female, and yet the valedictorian was male and he made numerous references to the ties of friendship formed at the Normal School. Since he was not permitted social intercourse with thirty eight

---

[65] McGill University Archives, Accession No. 145, Scrapbook #1, p. 14.

of forty of his class mates, we may assume that he did not mean what he was saying and was ignoring a de facto situation. Other speakers at that ceremony, all referred to the students as "he". The rules and bye-laws of the McGill Normal School, however, showed an excessive consciousness of the differences in sex. Bye-laws number 4,[66] for example, forbade friendly relationships between the sexes in the school, or on the way, or at the residences where visits were expressly not permitted. If the extent of the determination to maintain segregation by sex be considered in juxtaposition to the ignoring of sex differences in official references to life at the School, and to the eliminating of references to the de facto preponderant presence of women students, by such practices as using "he" to represent the students at the Normal School, then it may be assumed that male supremacy was taken for granted.

But this concept of supremacy must not be exaggerated. In essence, life at the Normal School revealed not so much sex discrimination, as class discrimination. The mere fact that the male like the female, could so easily be bound by so many restrictions, shows that his "supremacy" was indeed of a very indifferent calibre. All the students were equal "sufferers", the male perhaps even more than the female.

---

[66]McGill University Archives, Accession No. 927/1/7, March 1889, Record of Bye-laws, number 4.

CONCLUSION

The hypothesis presented in the introductory chapter of this thesis consists of six parts. First, there are indications that the McGill Normal School, essential to the educational needs of Protestant Quebec at the time, was nevertheless formed and maintained at the lowest possible cost. Second, it provided training for rather poorly qualified students; who, third, came from poor families. Fourth, these observations, if accurate, indicate a low priority given to elementary education; and, hence, fifth, to education as a whole; and, finally, sixth, such discrimination as was evident in the McGill Normal School, was above all, a class distinction based on financial status. The validity of the fourth, fifth, and sixth parts, depends on the accuracy of the first three.

The McGill Normal School is not the only institution about which such a hypothesis can be made, but if the hypothesis is correct, it does throw light both on the school itself and on the society which it served.

The first part of the hypothesis is borne out by the observations in this thesis on the salaries, pensions, and job security of the members of the staff; also by the observations concerning the state of the buildings and the continuous difficulties of obtaining money. Salary payments, though above the average for teachers, as indeed they should have

been since they were paid to teachers of future teachers, were still low, inequably distributed, and so organized as to leave the teacher in a weak negotiating position. Pension payments were below even the expectations of the time, and indeed unjust. Hicks, for example, and the Normal Committee, as shown in Chapter II, all expected that Hicks' pension income would be much higher than it was in fact. Job security depended on good fortune, good health, continued ability, and the right connections.

The second and third parts of the hypothesis are demonstrated by the entrance requirements, and the various bursaries and scholarships. There is also further evidence from the nature of the curriculum which seems to have been designed to inculcate rather than to stimulate, to train rather than to enlighten, and to make for a rather monotonous life for the students and even the teachers.

If these assertions are correct, then it may reasonably be assumed that neither elementary education nor education as a whole, was considered of high priority to the society of the time. The many warnings and directions given by leaders of the society, concerning the limits of and dangers from education and teachers, tend to corroborate this view. The section of the population, moreover, that is most hard hit by such priorities, is that section that is weakest financially, even though it may, numerically, be a huge segment of the population, and the most notable discrimination

in such social arrangements is class distinction based on financial status.

The growth and prosperity of the McGill Normal School is not in contradiction to the conclusion that education was considered by the society of the time, as a somewhat less essential requirement, and it is almost a truism to assert that much more progress could have been made had it been given more importance. The number of teachers too, who graduated with one diploma or another, from the School, while indicating an achievement, tends to obscure the fact that these diplomas were given for courses ranging from four months to three years, to students who began at rather low levels in the first place. Nor was the number of teachers sufficient to meet the requirements of universal elementary education, since roughly sixty teachers, fewer in the first years and more than sixty in other years, graduated each year, while many left the profession after only three or four years of teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, John. The Protestant School System in the Province of Quebec. New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., Montreal: E.M. Renoux, 1902.

Andreassen, John C.L. "A Pictorial Study." McGill Journal of Education, Vol. VI, No. 1, Spring, 1971.

Audet, Louis-Philippe. "Education in Canada East and Quebec, 1840-1875." Canadian Education: A History. Edited by J. Donald Wilson, Robert M. Stamp, and Louis-Philippe Audet. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice Hall of Canada Ltd., 1970.

Audet, Louis Philippe. Histoire du Conseil de l'Instruction Publique de la Province de Québec 1856-1964. Montréal: Editions Leméac, 1964.

Brubacher, John S. A History of the Problems of Education. Second Edition. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966.

Burton, Pierre. The Smug Minority. Toronto, Montreal: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1968.

Calam, John. "McGill Trains Teachers: 1857-1964." The Teachers' Magazine, Vol. XLV. No. 223, Sept., 1964.

Cooper, John Irwin. "The Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers Centenary Salute." The Educational Record, Vol. 80, April to June, 1964.

Dawson, William. Fifty Years of Work in Canada. London: Ballantyne, Hanson, 1901.

Gillett, Margaret. We Walked Very Warily. A History of Women at McGill. Montreal: Eden Press, Women's Publications, 1981.

Hunte, Keith D. The Development of the System of Education in Canada East. 1841 to 1867. A Historical Survey. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. McGill University, April, 1962.

Jobling, J. Keith. Hicks, William Henry. Biographical Note. Montreal.

Meilleur, Jean-Baptiste. Mémorial de l'Education du Bas-Canada. Québec: Des Presses à Vapeur de léger Brousseau, 1876.

Monroe, D.C. "The Education of Teachers Seventy Years Ago." The Educational Record of the Province of Quebec, Vol. LXVII. No. 1, Jan.-March, 1951.

Parmelee, George. "English Education." Canada and Its Provinces. Vol. XVI. Province of Quebec. Edited by Adam Shortt and Arthur Doughty. Toronto, Edinburgh: Edition T. & A. Constable, 1914.

Rexford, Orrin B. Teacher Training in the Province of Quebec. A Historical Study to 1857. Unpublished M.A. thesis. McGill University, August, 1936.

Simon, Brian. The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870. London: Lawrence & Wishar, 1874.

Vallee, Frank G., and Whyte, Donald. "Canadian Society: Trends and Perspectives." Canadian Society. Sociological Perspectives. Edited by Bernard R. Blishen, Frank E. Jones, Kaspar D. Naegele, and John Porter. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1971.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Annual Report of the Colonial Church and School Society, 1856.

Journal of Education (Quebec). Vol. 1. No. 1, Jan. 1857.

Journal of Ecucation (Quebec). Vol. 1, No. 3, March, 1857.

McGill University Archives. Statement of Gross Receipts and Expenditures of the McGill Normal School, 1857 to 1879.

McGill University Archives. Accession No. 145. Minute Book of the Meetings of the McGill Normal Committee, 1857 to 1907.

_____. Accession No. 145. Student Enrollment, 1857 to 1868.

_____. Accession No. 145. Bye-laws of the Normal School Literary Association.

_____. Accession No. 145. Minute Book of the Literary Association, 1859 to 1874.

_____. Accession No. 145. Letter Book, 1857 to 1907.

McGill University Archives. Accession No. 145, Cash Book. Summary of Revenues and Expenditures. 1857 to 1907.

_____. Accession NO. 145, Prospectus 1857 to 1907.

_____. Accession No. 145, Principals' Reports.

_____. Accession Nos. 267/10, 18, 21, 22, 40, 81. Letters of the 1890's.

_____. Accession Nos. 637/411 Minutes of the Corporation Committee of McGill University, 1857 to 1907.

_____. Accession No. 927/3. The Lower Canada Teachers' Association Rules and Regulations. 1856.

_____. Accession No. 927/1/10. Regulations of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction.

_____. Accession No. 927/1/41. General Rules and Regulations for the Establishment of Normal Schools in Lower Canada, 1856.

_____. Accession No. 927/3/57. Pay List, 1857.

_____. Accession No. 927/1/7. Bye-laws of the Montreal Normal School, March, 1889.

_____. Accession No. 927/3/24. Letters, 1857.

_____. Accession No. 927/3/64. Model School 1857.

_____. Accession No. 927/24/42c. Letter to Minister of Public Instruction, 1873.

_____. Accession No. 927/24/42c. Memoire Wants of McGill Normal School, 1873.

_____. Accession No. 927/17/31. Letters 1868.

McGill University Archives. Accession No. 927/14/3. Act for Promotion of Superior Education, 1856.

_____. Accession No. 927/10/24. J.W. Dawson Official Papers, Memorandum 1859.

_____. Accession No. 927/4/29. Letters 1856.

_____. Accession No. 927/18. Report by W.J. Dawson to Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1867.

_____. Accession No. 927/9/121A. Letters, 1859.

_____. Accession No. 927/11/36. W.J. Dawson papers, July 15, 1859.

_____. Accession No. 2211/27/42. Letters 1870.

Montreal Gazette. March 5, 1857. April 20, 1870.

_____. April 20, 1870.

Montreal Witness. January, 1856.