

The History of Canadian Education : ***A Bibliographical Note***

by Alan H. CHILD *

This paper will discuss some of the most useful books and articles which deal with the history of Canadian education. The fact that up until a few years ago most of such works were written by educational administrators rather than by professional historians has had several important consequences. First, many "facts" have been related and interpretations made with scant attention to tests of evidence. Second, those aspects have been stressed which were directly related to the present. Third, the present is often treated as being both inevitable and desirable. Finally, in the interests of harmony, conflicts and tensions have been minimized. Because of this last consequence, the history of Canadian education tends to be a dull field of study in which the identification of vital issues is difficult. A striking exception to the above is the topic of church-state relations. The recent professional attention given to the history of Canadian education has resulted in a revisionist approach.

Because some aspects of the development of Canadian education have been inadequately dealt with historically, the student must read not only historical works but also educational surveys. Some of the more significant of the latter will be dealt with in this paper.

Three books attempt to deal comprehensively with the history of Canadian education. The first of these appeared in 1957, C. E. Phillips' *The Development of Education in Canada*.¹ The book is organized into four main parts: The French Regime, The Beginning of Education under British Rule, The Development of Public School Systems, and Educational Thought and Practice. The Preface to the book states at least some of its biases and limitations. Phillips admits that he largely ignores post-Confederation Quebec, university education, and private schools. He sees contemporary education as superior to the "meagre education" of two

* Associate Professor of History, Notre Dame College.

¹ C. E. PHILLIPS, *The Development of Education in Canada* (Toronto: Gage, 1957).

centuries ago and wants to know how the change took place.² Consequently, Phillips takes a condescending attitude toward the past: "By any such criterion of course, the past is likely to suffer in comparison with the present."

Phillips is not concerned with contemporary social problems. As twentieth century education is universal and democratic, what problems could there be? There is room for improvements, of course, but, as we are going in the right direction, these will, it seems, develop inevitably if only we keep to our present course. Phillips says that life in Canada is better today than it used to be, and a "golden age" is just over the horizon.

Phillips judges past developments "by the values of the present." The actors' behavior appears to be explained by the extent to which they envisioned the enlightened educational system we enjoy today. Failures are either ignored or treated as annoying impediments of progress. Egerton Ryerson emerges as a man with an unusually clear vision of the future. His division of powers between central and local authorities gained acceptance and was therefore wise and enlightened. Phillips does not ask such questions as: What justification was there for the division that was made? Would a less centralized system have been possible and desirable? To Phillips, John Strachan represents the forces of reaction and special privilege. Thus, Strachan's comprehensive educational plan of 1815 and his conflicts with the Colonial Office and the Legislative Council are not mentioned; they would only blur his dark image.

Although Phillips does not attempt to overcome his equalitarian, democratic bias, to his credit, he states it clearly. However, he does not mention his Protestant bias. The one apparent blemish on public education is the existence of separate schools, and in a revealing section Phillips wonders if perhaps early action might have prevented their development.³

Phillips gives more information on social conditions than is common in traditional histories of education, but is not particularly successful in relating these conditions to educational changes. It almost seems at times as though Phillips sees a divine law of progress as the chief causal

² *Ibid.*, p. xi.

³ "An Opportunity Lost," *ibid.*, pp. 310-312.

influence. He tells how the Canadian system of financing education developed:

From about the middle of the nineteenth century until shortly after Confederation, the champions of a new era fought the greatest campaign in our educational history. Their one goal was to secure free schools supported by the people through local taxation. Three preliminary achievements had set the stage: the establishment of determined central authorities, of regular grants, and of elected local trustees.⁴

Phillips assumes that any province not following the pattern was immature. "The free school controversy in British Columbia failed to develop local responsibility..."⁵ "The issue was confused in this province because most of the advocates of free schools wanted government to pay the whole cost..."⁶ "Hence the early struggle for free schools in British Columbia was simply an attempt to escape both school fees and local taxation."⁷ To Phillips, assumption of all school costs by the government is "paternalism." It appears that he considers the taxation of land a necessary condition of democratic control.

Much of the book is good in spite of the limitations imposed by the author. It occupies the same relationship to later studies that a pioneer's path has to modern highways. Although the later efforts may not follow the original one very closely, they would be impossible without it.

*A Brief History of Canadian Education*⁸ by Henry Johnson was probably written to provide under-graduate students with a more manageable text than Phillips'. It is difficult to think of any other justification for the book.

Bernard Bailyn's *Education in the Forming of American Society*⁹ may help to cause a revisionist approach to the history of Canadian education. Bailyn said that the main characteristic of the history of American education was its "separateness . . . , its detachment from the main stream of historical research, writing and teaching."¹⁰ This history concerned

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

⁸ F. H. JOHNSON, *A Brief History of Canadian Education* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1968).

⁹ Bernard BAILYN, *Education in the Forming of American Society* (New York: Random House, 1960).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

itself almost exclusively with formal institutions of instruction and viewed the past as "simply the present writ small."¹¹

Convinced that Bailyn's criticisms applied to the Canadian field and to Phillips' work in particular, two young Canadian historians, J. Donald Wilson and Robert M. Stamp, determined to produce a study placing "Canadian educational development more centrally in the mainstream of Canadian social development."¹² Later, Louis-Philippe Audet joined them to edit *Canadian Education: A History*. The publication of this book in 1970 marked an important milestone in the historiography of Canadian education. The authors include the three editors and William B. Hamilton, Manoly R. Lupul, Robert S. Patterson, Alison Prentice, Edward F. Sheffield, and Hugh A. Stevenson. Although differences in style, emphasis and weight of original research are evident, a degree of unity is achieved through the common view of education as an aspect of social history.

As a result of this book, practically every phase of Canadian education has now been dealt with effectively, albeit briefly in some cases. Five chapters by Audet, all of which were originally written in French, are devoted to New France and Quebec. Higher education is not neglected. Every Canadian university is mentioned at least once, and some universities several times.¹³ The treatment of private schools, although more extensive than that of Phillips, still leaves much to be desired.

Part One, "Foundations," considers French, English, and American contributions to Canadian education.

The chapter by Hamilton on the Maritime Provinces and those by Wilson on Upper Canada, all of which appear in Part Two, "Colonial Beginnings," are perhaps the strongest in the entire book. Wilson's treatment of Strachan's failure to establish a school system is excellent. The small population, the scarcity of teachers and textbooks, the lack

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10. For a recent attempt to view American education in a wider perspective, see Lawrence A. CREMIN, *American Education: The Colonial Experience* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

¹² J. DONALD WILSON, ROBERT M. STAMP, and LOUIS-PHILIPPE AUDET, *Canadian Education: A History* (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. viii. (This reference is cited hereafter as *Canadian Education*.) They were also influenced by two English works: Kenneth CHARLTON, *Education in Renaissance England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Hall, 1960); Brian SIMON, "The History of Education" in J. W. TIBBLE (ed.), *The Study of Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Hall, 1966).

¹³ McGill, Toronto, Queen's, and British Columbia are each referred to at least ten times.

of responsible government and differences of opinion as to the role of religion are, in Wilson's view, the reasons for the failure. Equally masterful is Wilson's analysis of Ryerson's role. Was Ryerson an innovator or an imitator? After a thoughtful consideration, Wilson concludes that the question is "of little consequence since his [Ryerson's] primary goal was to see [his ideas] implemented."¹⁴

Part Three, "Society and Education in the New Dominion" is a rather confusing and disjointed attempt to deal with the period from the 1870's to 1945 in one hundred and twenty pages. The reader can perhaps approach it most profitably by considering the chapters as loosely related articles with a common theme. Assuming that improved transportation and communication enabled more "inter-provincial sharing of educational ideas" after the mid-1870's, the editors chose a national rather than a regional approach to this period. In consequence, similarities among the provinces are emphasized and differences largely ignored. Furthermore, as the various authors were encouraged to pursue their own themes, and as the separate school question proved to be a favorite, secular British Columbia is neglected.

Part Four, "New Directions in Canadian Education," is an equally ambitious and, on the whole, more successful attempt to present important developments since 1945. *Canadian Education* is at this time an unexcelled source of information on educational theories and practices since World War II. University expansion, the community college movement, student radicalism, federal participation, continuous progress, and educational television, as well as the numerous royal commissions of the period, are all described.

The book's greatest weaknesses arise from the same source as its greatest strengths: namely, the large number of contributors. Although there are no contradictions, there is too little continuity and too much duplication. Another weakness, if one accepts the Bailyn thesis, is that, while the book does place schooling in a social perspective, it is nevertheless a history of schooling rather than of education. A history of Canadian education which considers such institutions as the family has yet to be written.

¹⁴ *Canadian Education*, p. 238.

There are many regional historical studies. In 1911 Gosselin dealt thoroughly with the history of education in New France.¹⁵ The extent and diversity of schooling and the part played by the clergy were thoroughly discussed. A six-volume study by Audet, *Le système scolaire de la Province de Québec*, is devoted mainly to Lower Canada between the Conquest and the Act of Union.¹⁶ Audet's conclusion concerning the Royal Institution, to which he devotes two volumes, is that, although it represented an attempt to Anglicize and Protestantize the population, it could have been used by the French-Canadians to establish schools. Other writers have assumed that the clergy and the French-Canadian population had no alternative but to oppose the Royal Institution.¹⁷

The period to 1876 in Ontario has been treated rather thoroughly. Hodgins' twenty-eight volume work¹⁸ provides ample source material but its lack of topical organization makes it useful to only the most painstaking researchers. Harris has recently attempted to facilitate the use of Hodgins' massive study by writing an index, which unfortunately deals only with higher education.¹⁹

Coleman's *Public Education in Upper Canada*, which is concerned with the period 1791 to 1841, remained useful for details of subjects and teaching methods in the early schools.²⁰ Although Coleman's chief interest appears to be public schools, he does not slight charitable schools.²¹

John Strachan was a favorite villain of liberal historians. Educational historians have been remarkably slow to notice that his role in education as well as in politics has been reassessed. G. W. Spragge credits him with laying a good foundation for Ontario's educational system.²²

¹⁵ Amédée GOSSELIN, *L'Instruction au Canada sous le régime français* (Quebec: Laffamme, 1911).

¹⁶ Louis-Philippe AUDET, *Le système scolaire de la Province de Québec* (Quebec: Les Presses Universitaires de Laval, 1950-6).

¹⁷ See, for example, W. P. PERCIVAL, *Should We All Think Alike? Differentiating Characteristics of French Canadian Education in Quebec* (Montreal: Gage, 1951).

¹⁸ J. G. HODGINS, *The Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada from the Passing of the Constitutional Act in 1791 to the Close of Doctor Ryerson's Administration of the Education Department in 1876* (Toronto: Warwick, 1894-1910).

¹⁹ R. S. HARRIS, *An Index to J. G. Hodgins' Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1966).

²⁰ H. T. J. COLEMAN, *Public Education in Upper Canada* (New York: Brandow, 1907).

²¹ Interesting details, concerning the monitorial schools are given. *Ibid.*, pp. 83 ff.

²² G. W. SPRAGGE, "John Strachan's Contributions to Education, 1800-1823," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXII (June, 1941), 147-158. See also A. N. BETHUNE, *Memoirs of the Right Reverend John Strachan* (Toronto: H. Rowsell, 1870); J. L. H. HENDERSON, *John Strachan* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1967); G. W. SPRAGGE, *The John Strachan Letter Book 1812-1834* (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1946).

The Whigs' hero, of course, was Egerton Ryerson. C. B. Sissons' two-volume work is devoted to Ryerson's correspondence, together with a commentary.²³ The second volume deals with the period when Ryerson was superintendent of education and is therefore of more interest to the historian of education than the first volume. Putnam wrote a very good biography of Ryerson,²⁴ in which he answered in the negative the question, "Would the schools of 1876 have been what they were had there been no Ryerson?"²⁵ After all, says Putnam rather naively, the schools could not have been the same because Ryerson gave the people "what he thought they needed... [not] what they wanted."²⁶

A brief treatment of the early history of education in the Atlantic colonies and provinces is to be found in Frecker's book on the subject.²⁷ Rowe's *History of Education in Newfoundland* traces the origins and growth of that province's unique multi-denominational school system.²⁸ MacNaughton's excellent study of New Brunswick's school system might well serve as a model for educational histories of other provinces.²⁹ The author's stated purpose also might well be adopted by others: "to set developments in New Brunswick education against the social, political, and economic background of the province, [and] to relate them to the wider field of educational movements in Britain, Europe, the United States and other parts of British North America."³⁰ Because of this approach, one is made aware of the extent of conscious borrowing by the architects of the New Brunswick system. Unfortunately, the study stops at 1900 and has no sequel.

The most comprehensive study of the friction in Canada between the Roman Catholic Church and supporters of a secular school system

²³ C. B. SISSONS, *Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1937).

²⁴ J. H. PUTNAM, *Egerton Ryerson and Education in Upper Canada* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1912).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

²⁷ G. A. FRECKER, *Education in the Atlantic Provinces* (Toronto: Gage, 1956). See also G. MORRISON, "The History of Education in Nova Scotia," *The Canadian College of Teachers*, V (1962), 41-53.

²⁸ F. W. ROWE, *The History of Education in Newfoundland* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1952).

²⁹ Katherine MACNAUGHTON, *The Development of the Theory and Practice of Education in New Brunswick 1784-1900* (Fredericton: University of New Brunswick, 1947).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

is *Church and State in Canadian Education* by C. B. Sissons,³¹ which deals from the Protestant point of view with the problem in each of the provinces in turn. The importance of developments in Canada (Ontario and Quebec) between 1841 and 1867 cannot be overemphasized as they set a pattern for later developments there and elsewhere. Walker's very good documentary study of Upper Canada in this period, written from the Catholic point of view,³² shows the depth of feeling upon both sides and the influence of the struggle upon the development of political parties. Adams has recently charged Ryerson with a large degree of responsibility for the separation of schools on a religious basis.³³ He contends that by insisting upon a Protestant bias in the public schools, Ryerson forced the Catholics to separate.

The question, which turns principally upon Ryerson's objection to Cameron's Bill of 1849, seems sufficiently pertinent to merit a digression. An elaborate school bill prepared by Malcolm Cameron, Minister of Public Works, was passed by the legislature. "Amongst other drastic changes, all provisions for separate schools disappeared."³⁴ When Ryerson threatened to resign, "prime minister" Baldwin agreed not to enforce the Act, and Cameron then resigned. Adams contends that Ryerson believed that weak separate schools would guarantee the survival of Protestant common schools.³⁵ Striking at this conclusion may appear, it does not differ significantly from that of Sissons: "... Separate schools were saved not by the vigilance and exertions of Roman Catholics, but by the firmness and idealism of a Protestant minister. The saving, to be sure, was incidental and the result of his insisting on a religious foundation and the support of the religious bodies for education in Upper Canada."³⁶ Putnam states that Ryerson opposed Cameron's Act because it aimed to destroy the usefulness of the Chief Superintendent; excluded clergymen from being school visitors; destroyed the provincial nature of the school system;

³¹ C. B. SISSONS, *Church and State in Canadian Education (An Historical Study)* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1959). See also R. A. HILTZ, "Religion in State Schools of Canada," *Religious Education*, XXII (June, 1927), 606-610.

³² F. A. WALKER, *Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada* (Toronto: Thomas Nelson, 1955). The sequel to the book is F. A. WALKER, *Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario* (Toronto: Thomas Nelson, 1955).

³³ H. ADAMS, *The Education of Canadians 1800-1867: The Roots of Separatism* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1967).

³⁴ SISSONS, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

³⁵ ADAMS, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-3.

³⁶ SISSONS, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

injured the prospects of a Normal School; subjected teachers to serious loss in collecting their salaries; re-established school sections in towns and cities; made no provision for uniform textbooks; and was generally cumbersome and unworkable.³⁷ In other words, the issue of separate schools had nothing to do with Ryerson's opposition to the act, and in any case, Putnam concludes, seeing that the act was never put into effect, "it has no interest for us, except insofar as it shows the evolution of [the next act]." ³⁸

The most dramatic of Canadian separate school controversies, in Manitoba, has been documented by Lovell Clark.³⁹ Although his commentary is frankly sympathetic to the Catholic point of view, there is a good balance in the documents presented. Lupul has dealt with the school question in Alberta and Saskatchewan.⁴⁰ Armstrong gives the Orange Lodge version of separate schools with special reference to those of Saskatchewan.⁴¹ Two articles in *Politics in Saskatchewan* deal with the same contentious issue.⁴² The *Separate School Question in Canada* by George Weir concerns itself with judicial decisions affecting the educational rights of the Roman Catholic minority.⁴³ The related question of bilingual schools has been treated effectively by Sissons up to 1917.⁴⁴

There are several provincial studies which are concerned mainly with the period since 1876. Ross's book is a survey of Ontario's school system

³⁷ PUTNAM, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

³⁹ L. CLARK, *The Manitoba School Question: Majority Rule or Minority Rights* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1968). See also G. R. COOK, "Church, Schools and Politics in Manitoba," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXIX (March, 1958), 1-24.

⁴⁰ M. R. LUPUL, "Educational Crisis in the New Dominion to 1917," *Canadian Education*; M. R. LUPUL, "The Campaign for a French Catholic School Inspector in the Northwest Territories 1898-1903," *Canadian Historical Review*, XLVIII (December, 1967), 332-352; M. R. LUPUL, "Relations in Education between the State and the Roman Catholic Church in the Canadian North-West with Special Reference to the Provisional District of Alberta, 1880-1905" (unpublished doctoral thesis: Harvard University, 1963).

⁴¹ W. H. G. ARMSTRONG, *Separate Schools: Introduction of the Dual System into Eastern Canada and its Subsequent Extension to the West* (no place of publication given: no publisher given, 1918).

⁴² N. WARD and D. SPAFFORD, *Politics in Saskatchewan* (Don Mills: Longmans, 1968). The two articles are "Ballots and Burning Crosses" by Patrick KYBA, and "Politics, Schools and the French Language, 1881-1931" by Keith McLEOD.

⁴³ G. M. WEIR, *The Separate School Question in Canada* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1934).

⁴⁴ C. B. SISSONS, *Bilingual Schools in Canada* (London: Dent, 1917). See also M. PRANG, "Clerics, Politicians and the Bilingual School Issue in Ontario, 1910-1917," *Canadian Historical Review*, XLI (December 1960), 281-307. For a treatment of the more recent period, see M. BARBER, "The Ontario Bilingual Schools Issue: Sources of Conflict," *Canadian Historical Review*, XLVIII (September 1966), 227-248.

near the turn of the century.⁴⁵ Valuable details are given on school organization, pupils, courses of study, teachers, high schools, inspection and universities. *Quiet Evolution* by Harris brings the story of Ontario's school system almost up to date.⁴⁶

Several books which purport to give the history of Quebec's dual system of education are really no more than apologies and leave the student unprepared for the recommendations of the Parent Commission and the educational changes which were a part of the Quiet Revolution.⁴⁷

Two recent studies of school systems in the Far West merit attention: Johnson's *History of Public Education in British Columbia* and Chalmers' *Schools of the Foothills Province*.⁴⁸ Of the two, Johnson's is the better organized and researched. Chalmers' almost exclusive reliance upon a topical organization forces the reader to travel the same road several times over and his dependence upon personal recollection and university theses gives the book a superficial quality. On the other hand, Chalmers succeeds in relating educational history to social history much better than Johnson does. Johnson's book is further weakened by the number of factual errors it contains. Both authors take a proprietary and defensive attitude toward "their" respective school systems.

Two books with a narrower scope than the above are *The Development of the Ontario High School* by Bell and *The Ontario Teacher, 1800-1910* by Althouse.⁴⁹ Bell suggests a number of issues that could well be studied further. First, while giving Ryerson full credit for his work in elementary education, Bell implies that Ryerson's attitude toward secondary schools was vague and confused.⁵⁰ At one time, Ryerson wanted

⁴⁵ George W. ROSS, *The School System of Ontario (Canada): Its History and Distinctive Features* (New York: Appleton, 1896). (Only twenty-three pages are devoted to the history of the system.)

⁴⁶ R. S. HARRIS, *Quiet Evolution: A Study of the Educational System of Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1967).

⁴⁷ W. P. PERCIVAL, *Across the Years: A Century of Education in the Province of Quebec* (Montreal: Gazette, 1946); *Life in Schools: An Explanation of the Protestant School System of the Province of Quebec* (no place of publication: no publisher given, 1940); *Should We All Think Alike? Differential Characteristics of French Canadian Education in Quebec* (Montreal: Gage, 1951); G. E. CARTER, *The Catholic Public Schools of Quebec* (Toronto: Gage, 1957).

⁴⁸ F. H. JOHNSON, *A History of Public Education in British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1964); J. W. CHALMERS, *Schools of the Foothills Province* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1967).

⁴⁹ W. N. BELL, *The Development of the Ontario High School* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1918); J. G. ALTHOUSE, *The Ontario Teacher 1800-1910* (Toronto: Gage, 1929).

⁵⁰ BELL, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-9.

nothing less than a classical curriculum; at another, "a great hotch-potch of practical information." In attacking the latter view, Bell gives eloquent expression to his belief in liberal education:

One can sympathize with . . . this desire for the education that will fit a boy to be practical and to help develop the potential wealth of his country, without being blind to the pedagogical unsoundness. How much of this encyclopedic information could a normal boy attain, in the way Professor Young so admirably outlined? If he did not attain it in this way, it would not properly speaking, be educative at all. Mere information can be got in the streets, in the shop and factory, and on the farm. Then, there is the newspaper and the encyclopedia. Except for what may be termed the facilities of intercourse, reading, writing, and counting, we should not need to maintain schools at all, for all the information described . . . [by Ryerson] with such rhetorical dash, could be better obtained elsewhere.⁵¹

Bell considers George Paxton Young the true founder of the Ontario secondary school. A biography of Young would certainly be a valuable addition to the historiography of Canadian education. A second issue suggested by Bell is the weakness of the secondary schools at the time of Ryerson's retirement. Bell says there were two main causes for the weakness: the use of the secondary school largely as a training school for teachers and a system of grants which encouraged "rapid and unwarranted promotion" from the common school.⁵² Althouse agrees that the latter was a problem before 1871, but seems to assume that legislation in that year corrected it.⁵³ In an equally uncritical vein, Harris says that the legislation "changed the system completely."⁵⁴

Althouse introduces the issue of class divisions among teachers. The secondary teachers, he says, enjoyed a privileged position "at first."⁵⁵ He considers that the requirement that all secondary teachers take "professional training" brought teaching "nearer that happy state in which there would be 'no aristocracy' but all would be 'noblemen,' when the humblest kindergartner need not take second place with the president of a university."⁵⁶ Althouse does not attribute any blame for the preservation of an "aristocracy" to a system which trained secondary and ele-

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 157. Bell states that the government grant for a high school pupil was fifty times greater than for a common school pupil.

⁵³ ALTHOUSE, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-7.

⁵⁴ HARRIS, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁵⁵ ALTHOUSE, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 156. The writer cannot help but wonder what Althouse's reaction would have been to practical proposals designed to achieve this "happy state."

mentary teachers in separate institutions. Writing forty years later, Harris saw a definite connection.⁵⁷

There are several books on higher education, some by eminent Canadian historians, but no synthesis. *Changing Patterns of Higher Education*,⁵⁸ a collection of four essays, is a disappointing attempt to deal with recent trends that have influenced the development of universities and colleges. D. C. Masters' effective study of Protestant church colleges gives, within the limits of its subject, the only general treatment so far accorded to the history of Canadian higher education.⁵⁹ It traces the origin of denominational colleges, their development in a "Golden Age" (1829-1867), their later decline under the influence of new ideas concerning science and biblical criticism, and the eventual federalism of most of them with secular institutions. A corresponding study of Catholic colleges is differently conceived, with its emphasis on a detailed contemporary survey.⁶⁰ Studies of particular institutions are in comparatively good supply.⁶¹ They are generally more parochial in scope than concentration on one college or university would seem to require, although A. S. Morton's *Saskatchewan* and W. L. Morton's *One University* are, in some parts, honourable exceptions.⁶² In one aspect at least this field is unusually well served: there is a well-arranged and well-indexed bibliography of works appearing before 1959.⁶³

Historians have barely touched the issues of control and philosophy of education. When writers trace the evolution of control they usually

⁵⁷ HARRIS, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-9. Since Alberta gave its university the responsibility of training all teachers in 1945, most other provinces have followed suit. Ontario is now (1971) making similar plans.

⁵⁸ R. S. HARRIS, *Changing Patterns of Higher Education in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1966).

⁵⁹ D. C. MASTERS, *Protestant Church Colleges in Canada: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1966).

⁶⁰ L. K. SHOOK, *Catholic Post-Secondary Education in English-Speaking Canada: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1971).

⁶¹ For example: A. FORGET, *Histoire du Collège de l'Assomption* (Montreal: Imprimerie Populaire, 1932); H. T. LOGAN, *Tuum Est: A History of the University of British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1958); R. S. LONGLEY, *Acadia University, 1838-1938* (Wolfville: Kentville, 1939); H. MCLENNAN, *McGill: The Story of a University* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1960); D. C. MASTERS, *Bishop's University: The First Hundred Years* (Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1950); W. S. WALLACE, *A History of the University of Toronto, 1827-1927* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1927).

⁶² A. S. MORTON, *Saskatchewan: The Making of a University* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1959); W. L. MORTON, *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1957).

⁶³ R. S. HARRIS and Arthur TREMBLAY, *A Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1960).

give the impression that its course was inevitable. Actually, three types of control have been in conflict: provincial, local, and professional. Althouse in a rare insight states: "There were now (c. 1900) three parties in any school discussion: the trustees, representing the ratepayers; the Department officials (including the inspectors); and the teachers. At times, the teachers felt that the other two were leagued against them."⁶⁴ *Interprovincial Co-operation in Education* by Stewart tells the story of the Canadian Education Association (C.E.A.).⁶⁵ Beginning as the Dominion Education Association, a teachers' organization, the C.E.A., the closest approach to a central educational agency in Canada, became in effect the creature of the provincial departments of education. On the time-honoured assumption that there is a necessary connection between control and support, Moffatt and Lloyd have written brief histories of educational finance.⁶⁶ Superficial and rudimentary, the studies' only real value is the conclusions reached. Moffatt wants local authorities to be free to exceed the government's "foundation program" and Lloyd believes that the government's contribution can reach fifty per cent without interfering with local autonomy.

Probably the most significant issue concerning the philosophy of education in the twentieth century has been the struggle for and against "progressivism." Aside from the work of Patterson, very little has been done to investigate this intriguing topic.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ ALTHOUSE, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁶⁵ F. K. STEWART, *Interprovincial Co-operation in Education: The Story of the Canadian Education Association* (Toronto: Gage, 1957).

⁶⁶ H. P. MOFFATT, *Educational Finance in Canada* (Toronto: Gage, 1957); W. LLOYD, *The Role of Government in Canadian Education* (Toronto: Gage, 1959).

⁶⁷ R. S. PATTERSON, "Society and Education during the Wars and their Interlude, 1914-1945," *Canadian Education*; R. S. PATTERSON, "The Establishment of Progressive Education in Alberta," unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1968. The most famous attack upon progressive education in Canada is of course Hilda NEATBY, *So Little for the Mind: An Indictment of Canadian Education* (Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1953).

