

# *The French Canadians and the Schools of the Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning, 1820-1829 \**

by Real G. BOULIANNE \*\*

The Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning, the first system of public education in Lower Canada, was established in 1801 by an act of the Legislature of that province.<sup>1</sup> Although the Act provided for a centralized, state controlled system of education, it left the initiative for the establishment of such schools to the residents of the seigneuries and townships.<sup>2</sup> No schools under its jurisdiction could be forced upon an unwilling population and the Roman Catholic Church and the majority of the French Canadians chose to ignore the Royal Institution.

Until 1818, there was, in fact, no legal body to govern the system of education provided by the Act of 1801, and by that date there were only thirty-seven schools in thirty-five areas<sup>3</sup> which were receiving government grants under the provisions of the Act. Seventeen of these schools were in what could be described as areas with considerable concentration of French-Canadian pupils (see Table I), but there was virtually no government supervision over any of these schools.

It was only in 1818, when the Board of Trustees of the Royal Institution was formed,<sup>4</sup> that a central organization was established finally to govern the system of education provided by the legislation of 1801. However, Mgr. Joseph-Octave Plessis, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec, refused to sit on the Board since he would have been subservient to the Lord Bishop of Quebec, Jacob Mountain, on what was essentially an Anglo-Protestant body. (See Table II for the composition of the Board of Trustees in 1818.) Plessis' refusal strengthened the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy to the Royal Institution.<sup>5</sup>

Nevertheless, the Royal Institution could start to function at last as a system of education. It had a central governing body, it was developing an effective local organization of commissioners and visitors as well as a system for licensing teachers and inspecting schools. The whole organiza-

\* An earlier version of this was read at the 50th Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, St. John's, Newfoundland, May 1971.

\*\* Vanier College, St. Laurent, Quebec.

<sup>1</sup> *The Provincial Statutes of Lower Canada*, Vol. III, 1801-1804, p. 128-138.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to clauses IV and VIII of the Act of 1801.

<sup>3</sup> *Journals of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada*, Vol. 28, 1819, Appendix (E), No. 13, Abstract of Warrants, 6 January-2 November 1818: (further references to these Journals will be abbreviated to *JHALC*).

<sup>4</sup> Louis-Philippe AUDET, *Le Système scolaire de la province de Québec*, Québec, les Presses universitaires Laval, 1952, Vol. III, p. 173-177.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 170-173.

tion began to operate effectively when the Rev. J. L. Mills,<sup>6</sup> an Anglican clergyman, was named Secretary to the Board. By 1820 he had started taking some sort of control over the existing government schools and the Royal Institution had begun to function as a system of public education for Lower Canada.<sup>7</sup>

The failure of the Royal Institution to remain in the field of public education may be attributed in part to the non-cooperation of the Roman Catholic Church,<sup>8</sup> but perhaps more so to the activities of the Assembly. The Assembly had been trying unsuccessfully since 1814 to pass educational legislation more suitable for the majority of the population of Lower Canada.<sup>9</sup> Finally, in 1829, it succeeded in passing the Syndics' Act.<sup>10</sup> Although this Act did not repeal the Act of 1801, financially it provided more generously for elementary schools, and what is more important, it established an educational organization more acceptable to the majority of the French Canadians<sup>11</sup> in that control over these schools was in the hands of the Assembly and not in those of the colonial authorities and of the Anglican Church. Indirectly, then, the Act of 1829 was responsible for the rapid decline of Royal Institution schools. (See Table III for the growth and decline of Royal Institution schools from 1801 to 1846.) In fact, the Royal Institution had served effectively as a system of government supported education approximately only from 1820 to 1829.

Until the publication of Louis-Philippe Audet's *Le Système scolaire de la province de Québec* in 1952, there had been really no comprehensive and well documented studies of the Royal Institution. On the basis of incomplete and deficient documentation most historians (particularly French-language historians) had seen in this school system a nefarious plot by the colonial authorities to assimilate the French Canadians. François-Xavier Garneau, whose influence on Canadian historiography is well known, is a good representative of this kind of approach to the issue:

On autorisa également l'établissement de l'Institution Royale, créée en apparence pour "l'encouragement de l'instruction publique", mais des-

<sup>6</sup> Mills came to Quebec in 1814 as garrison chaplain and was the first person appointed to the post of Secretary of the Board of Trustees; see: T. R. MILLMAN, *Jacob Mountain, First Lord Bishop of Quebec, A Study in Church and State, 1793-1825*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1947, Appendix (C), (no pagination); also, T. R. MILLMAN, *The Life of the Right Reverend, the Honourable Charles James Stewart*, London, Ontario, Huron College, p. 193 and p. 210.

<sup>7</sup> Mills had sent a detailed questionnaire early in 1820 to all teachers receiving government stipends. He inquired, among other things, about the founding of the school, and about supervision and inspections. The answers to this questionnaire contain valuable information, particularly about the period 1801 to 1820.

<sup>8</sup> AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 148-149, and p. 170-173.

<sup>9</sup> AUDET, *op. cit.*, p. 150-160, and p. 198-199; *JHALC*, Vol. 32, 1823, 27 January 1823, p. 46; for a full testimony of the witnesses before the committee see also, *JHALC*, Appendix A-Z, Vol. 33, 1823-1824, Appendix (Y); for a summary and commentaries on the work of this committee see, AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 200-220; for the passage of the Fabriques Act, see, AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 221-222.

<sup>10</sup> AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 103.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 103-109 (the law of 1829 explained).

tinée, dans la pensée de ses promoteurs à faciliter l'anglicisation du pays. La direction de l'enseignement, par cette dernière mesure, se trouva entre les mains du pouvoir exécutif. Le gouverneur nomma les administrateurs, désigna les paroisses où l'on ouvrirait des écoles, choisit des instituteurs; et à sa demande le roi dota en terres deux collèges qu'on se proposait de fonder, l'un à Québec, l'autre à Montréal. L'évêque protestant fut appelé à la présidence de l'Institution: cela la rendit impopulaire dès le principe. [Au surplus, elle n'exista jamais que de nom.] Les Canadiens, qui ne voulaient abjurer ni leur langue, ni leurs autels, la repoussèrent; et elle ne servit, pendant plus d'un quart de siècle, qu'à mettre obstacle à un système d'éducation plus conforme à leurs vœux.<sup>12</sup>

Like most historians, Garneau had placed too much emphasis and had given too much importance to the intentions of the initiators of the law of 1801 and had neglected the fact that the Royal Institution had started to function really as a school system only from 1818. The actual operation of the school system, particularly from 1820 to 1829 (its most productive years) was not studied seriously, and more often ignored completely.<sup>13</sup>

Audet's work, based primarily on the correspondence of the Royal Institution, documents virtually ignored by other historians, corrected many of the errors of previous studies, separated clearly the various stages in the development of the Royal Institution, avoided overstressing the intentions of its founders in 1801, and concentrated instead on its actual operation as a school system. He concluded that the French Canadians, without endangering their language and their faith, could have used the Royal Institution schools to their own advantage<sup>14</sup> — conclusions similar to Arthur Lower's unsubstantiated but perceptive statement of 1946:

The first membership of the Institution was far too heavily weighted with English and for that (a condition common to every phase of government in the province at that time) there is no defence. Yet if the French people had taken the Act and worked it, as they afterwards worked Responsible Government, they would sooner or later have brought matters to the same point of democratic control and would have had a system of free elementary education long before they actually obtained it.<sup>15</sup>

A study of Audet's scope can introduce as many topics requiring further investigation as it answers questions. One such topic is a specific examination of those areas of French-Canadian concentration in Royal Institution schools in order to determine whether the policies of the Royal Institution authorities, or the manner in which those policies were executed at the local

<sup>12</sup> François-Xavier GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada*, 8<sup>e</sup> édition, Montréal, Editions de l'Arbre, 1945, Vol. VII, p. 51-52.

<sup>13</sup> Réal G. BOULIANNE, *The Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning: The Correspondence, 1820-1829, A Historical and Analytical Study* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University, 1970), 5 Volumes, 1,419 p.; for a detailed analysis of the works of thirty-six historians who wrote on this topic from 1832 to 1962, see Vol. I, p. 33-201.

<sup>14</sup> AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 391-392.

<sup>15</sup> Arthur R. M. LOWER, *Colony to Nation, A History of Canada*, Toronto, Longmans Green, 1946, p. 156.

level were directed towards assimilation as so many historians have claimed. In order to determine this, the following points must be considered:

1) the location of the areas where there were significant concentrations of French Canadians — pupils, teachers, and officials — in Royal Institution schools;

2) the policies and activities of the central authorities towards the French Canadians in these schools;

3) the work and influence of the local authorities in these areas.<sup>16</sup>

Michel Brunet suggested in 1962 that in view of the fact that the French Canadians had formed the great majority of the population in Lower Canada at that time, the danger of assimilation through education had been virtually non-existent:

L'Institution Royale échoua. Les causes de son échec sont nombreuses. Par patriotisme, les Canadiens français aiment croire que leurs ancêtres ont déjoué les noirs desseins des anglicisateurs en acceptant volontairement de demeurer ignorants plutôt que de fréquenter les écoles de l'Institution Royale. . . . Les craintes qu'avait inspirées l'Institution Royale — craintes qui n'étaient que partiellement fondées car les Canadiens, étant en immense majorité, auraient canadianisé les écoles de l'Institution Royale, s'ils les avaient fréquentées, avant que celles-ci n'aient pu les angliciser. . . .<sup>17</sup>

Although legally the Act of 1801 had not provided for French and/or English schools, there were *de facto* French-Canadian Royal Institution schools. Audet lists twelve such schools in 1818 — schools established in French-Canadian areas and having French-Canadian teachers (see Table IV). However, for the purposes of this study, I should prefer to broaden the scope of this definition somewhat to include also schools where there was consistently a considerable number of French-Canadian pupils, teachers, and local officials, whether these formed a majority or a substantial minority within the school. These schools, where the French Canadians did form a strong minority, can yield valuable data for this study. For example, this definition would now include the Montreal National School where all the officials and teachers were English-speaking and Protestant, as was the majority of the pupils, but where consistently close to one third of the pupils were Roman Catholic, the great majority of these being French Canadians. Since this was a large school (in 1824, 110 of the 342 pupils were Roman Catholics),<sup>18</sup> the number of French-Canadian pupils coming under the influence

<sup>16</sup> The major sources consulted were the correspondence of the Royal Institution: *Minute-Books*, *Letter-Books*, and the incoming letters and petitions from commissioners, visitors, teachers, clergymen, and residents of the areas where the schools were located; and the *Journals of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada*, particularly the Appendices recording warrants for teachers' salaries as well as reports of committees of the Assembly on education.

<sup>17</sup> Michel BRUNET, "Evolution historique de notre système d'enseignement", in *Québec Canada Anglais, Deux Itinéraires un Affrontement*, Montréal, éditions H.M.H. collection Constantes, Vol. 12, 1968, p. 82; Brunet's article was written in 1962 but published in this collection of essays in 1968.

<sup>18</sup> McGill University Archives, *Accession 447/10*, Report, Montreal National School, [15 Nov. 1824]; (further reference to the McGill University Archives will

of the Royal Institution was considerable, and for the purposes of this study, such numbers could not be ignored. According to this broader definition, at least twenty-three schools can be identified as having had sufficient numbers of French Canadians to warrant investigation<sup>19</sup> (see Table V). Seven of these schools were in the District of Montreal, two in the District of Three Rivers, thirteen in that of Quebec, and one in Gaspé.

Historians who are most critical of the Royal Institution point to the powers given to the Governor by the Act of 1801 and quote the negative and sometimes hostile attitude of the colonial officials of the time towards the French Canadians. In fact the law did give the Governor considerable authority, and it is not particularly difficult to find statements by colonial officials of the late 18th and early 19th centuries expressing strong desires to use education to assimilate the French Canadians.<sup>20</sup> However, between 1801 and 1818 there had been virtually no control by the colonial authorities over schools receiving government stipends. The answers to the questionnaire that Mills had sent all government teachers in 1820 show quite clearly that these schools had not suffered from the interference of colonial officials in Quebec — quite the contrary. All that seems to have come from Quebec was the annual stipend! This period could not have been a dangerous one as far as the assimilation of the French Canadians through government supported schools was concerned. Eighteen of the twenty-three schools in Table V were founded during this period.

These conditions changed after 1818 when the government established its central agency to control Royal Institution schools. How did this new organization affect the French Canadians? To answer this, one must examine the activities of the Governor, of the Board of Trustees and its Secretary in this matter.

The authority given the Governor by the Act of 1801 included the appointment of the President and members of the Board of Trustees as well as all the employees necessary for the administration of the Royal Institution; the approval of the regulations passed by the Board; the commissioning of all local school officials; the licensing of teachers; the approval of all applications for Royal Institution schools.<sup>21</sup> However, this authority was handled through the office of the Civil Secretary, and upon the advice of the Board of Trustees through its Secretary. There was very little evidence found in the correspondence of the Royal Institution to suggest that the

be abbreviated to MGUA; unless otherwise stated, the number quoted and underlined will be the Accession Number).

<sup>19</sup> These schools were located not only by consulting the *JHALC*, but also by examining the complete correspondence of the Royal Institution, paying particular attention to the visitors' bi-annual reports, in the 117 areas in Lower Canada in which it conducted some kind of activity.

<sup>20</sup> Lionel GROULX, *L'Enseignement français au Canada*, Tome I, *Dans le Québec*, Montréal, Librairie d'Action canadienne-française, 1931, p. 75, 76, and 78; MILLMAN, *Mountain*, p. 71.

<sup>21</sup> For more details regarding the powers of the Governor, refer to the Act of 1801 (see reference No. 1).

Governor had interfered personally in educational matters, the one important exception being the negotiations with the Roman Catholic hierarchy to alter the structures of the Royal Institution to make them more acceptable to French-Canadian Roman Catholics.

It would seem that the Governor himself, Lord Dalhousie, had initiated these negotiations with the Roman Catholic hierarchy. On June 10, 1821, he had written to the Colonial Secretary, Lord Bathurst, that it would be desirable to form a Catholic institution similar to the Royal Institution.<sup>22</sup> Dalhousie and his successor, Sir James Kempt, negotiated seriously with Mgr. Joseph-Octave Plessis and his successor, Mgr. Bernard-Claude Panet, to organize a more suitable educational system, one that took into consideration the French-speaking Roman Catholic population of Lower Canada. The final agreement reached provided for two independent committees within the structure of the Royal Institution — a Catholic Committee and a Protestant Committee.<sup>23</sup> The necessary bill was presented to the Assembly, but on March 5, 1829, it was referred to the next session,<sup>24</sup> and that same day the Assembly introduced its own educational legislation, the Syndics' Act. The bill for the formation of the two committees of the Royal Institution was never re-introduced. As far as the personal intervention by the Governors in the affairs of the Royal Institution was concerned, it had been of a positive nature and sensitive to the educational interests of the French Canadians.

The policies and activities of the Board of Trustees were likewise of a positive nature. Its regulations were sufficiently flexible to permit the French Canadians to use Royal Institution schools without fear of entering an exclusively Anglo-Protestant system. Among these regulations were the following:

- 1) a separate list of French textbooks for French-speaking pupils (see Table VI);
- 2) priests were invited to inspect the schools and to visit the pupils of their denomination;
- 3) provision for the separation of religious worship in the schools;
- 4) regular inspections by local visitors, residents of the area, who were to report to the Board bi-annually.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the regulations of the Board left sufficient control over this educational process to the local authorities that the French Canadians could have controlled in fact the Royal Institution schools in their parishes had they so desired.

<sup>22</sup> Public Archives of Canada, *Series "Q" 157-1*, p. 193-194, Dalhousie-Bathurst, 10 June 1821; (further reference to this source will be abbreviated to PAC).

<sup>23</sup> For a detailed description of these negotiations, see: AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 3-105; the correspondence of the Royal Institution contains a good part of the documentation regarding these negotiations.

<sup>24</sup> AUDET, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 95.

<sup>25</sup> These regulations start appearing in the correspondence of the Royal Institution in the early 1820's.

The Board and the Secretary interfered at the local level only when serious problems were referred to them by the visitors themselves, or when major abuses were reported through other sources. Their intervention was conducted generally with cautious deliberation, particularly where French Canadians were concerned. The situation in Terrebonne, one of the most complex and delicate the Board had to handle, illustrates this point.

The English residents of Terrebonne had supported their own school since approximately 1790,<sup>26</sup> and only from 1812 did they receive a government stipend for their teacher.<sup>27</sup> In 1814, a government school for French-speaking pupils was established in this village also, with Augustin Vervais as teacher.<sup>28</sup> By 1824 it had become apparent that neither school was doing well and the Seigneur of Terrebonne, the Hon. Roderick Mackenzie, an official visitor, complained to Mills about this.<sup>29</sup> The Hon. and Rev. C. J. Stewart (later the second Lord Bishop of Quebec and President of the Royal Institution) investigated the English school of James Walker, came to the conclusion that Terrebonne could not support two Royal Institution schools, and recommended that Walker be offered a transfer to the Township of Rawdon.<sup>30</sup> Vervais, left as the sole Royal Institution teacher in Terrebonne, was instructed to have English as well as French taught in his school.<sup>31</sup> However, his record of incompetence from 1814 to 1824 worked against him,<sup>32</sup> and on May 21, 1825, Mackenzie recommended his dismissal to the Board of Trustees.<sup>33</sup> From that time, the Board was deluged with petitions for and against Vervais!<sup>34</sup> Despite the weight of the evidence against Vervais, the Board took almost a year to review the case before declaring him totally incompetent.<sup>35</sup> They recommended his dismissal to the Governor on April 17, 1826.<sup>36</sup> Typically, the Board had interfered in a local matter upon request, and had done so with caution and deliberation.

The Terrebonne situation produced an interesting side effect. After Vervais' dismissal, curé St. Germain began to take an active part in the administration of the Royal Institution school in his parish. In fact, he virtually selected Vervais' successors, first Thomas Neagle and then Alex-

<sup>26</sup> MGUA, 447/6, Dr. Simon Fraser-Hon. Roderick Mackenzie, and Jacob Oldham, 12 May 1823.

<sup>27</sup> *JHALC*, 1812-1813, Appendix (E).

<sup>28</sup> *JHALC*, 1816, Appendix (D).

<sup>29</sup> MGUA, 447/10, Mackenzie-Mills, 28 Oct. 1824.

<sup>30</sup> MGUA, 447/11, Stewart-Mills, 1 Mar. 1825.

<sup>31</sup> MGUA, 100/2, p. 130, Mills-[Mackenzie], 7 Apr. 1825.

<sup>32</sup> MGUA, 447/12, Mackenzie-Mills, 16 May 1825; twelve letters supporting the charge of incompetence against Vervais were enclosed.

<sup>33</sup> MGUA, 447/12, Mackenzie-Mills, 21 May 1825.

<sup>34</sup> These numerous petitions can be found in: MGUA, 447/15, 447/16, 447/17.

<sup>35</sup> MGUA, 447/16, Report of the committee of the Board of Trustees, 10 Apr. 1826.

<sup>36</sup> MGUA, 100/3, p. 50, Mills-A. W. Cochran (Civil Secretary), 17 Apr. 1826; 100/3, p. 50, Mills-Vervais, 17 Apr. 1826; 100/3, p. 50-51, Mills-Mackenzie, 17 Apr. 1826; 100/3, p. 51, Mills-Frs. Coyteux (visitor), 17 Apr. 1826.

ander McDonald, both bilingual Roman Catholics,<sup>37</sup> and finally F.-X. Valade, a bilingual French Canadian.<sup>38</sup> St. Germain became the acknowledged principal visitor of Terrebonne.<sup>39</sup> It is worth considering whether other parish priests could not have done the same thing.

For the licensing of teachers, the policy of the Board in general was to interfere as little as possible with the choice of the local school authorities. Mills stated this on numerous occasions. He mentioned it to George Alexander of Durham, to the Rev. Joseph Abbott, an Anglican clergyman residing in Argenteuil, to the Rev. Edward Black, a Presbyterian clergyman.<sup>40</sup> My own investigation of the complete correspondence of the 117 areas of Royal Institution activities between 1820 and 1829 confirms this policy.

Furthermore, in French-speaking areas, the Board's policy was to appoint French-speaking Roman Catholic teachers. The following examples illustrate this fundamental principle. In 1822, Mills told A. Hennessy that he would not be recommended for teaching posts either in Cap Santé or in Pointe Lévis unless he could convince the local visitors that he was sufficiently fluent in French to teach in that language.<sup>41</sup> Hennessy received neither appointment. When the Rev. J. C. Driscoll, an Anglican clergyman, interfered with the administration of the school in Berthier and refused to consider the application of a prospective teacher because he was a Roman Catholic, Mills stated very plainly to Driscoll that this was contrary to Royal Institution policy and, that same day, he wrote to the Seigneur of Berthier to re-affirm this policy.<sup>42</sup> Although the residents of Baie St. Paul had requested the appointment of W. H. Christy as teacher,<sup>43</sup> Mills was unwilling to recommend his appointment because Christy was a Protestant, but he did so finally because of the pressure from the residents.<sup>44</sup> Nevertheless, Mills stressed his misgivings in this matter both to Christy and to the visitors,<sup>45</sup> and when a short time later the people rejected Christy and

<sup>37</sup> MGUA, 447/18, Report, Terrebonne, 4 Nov. 1826; 447/25, Mackenzie-Mills, 14 Sep. 1828; 100/4, p. 54, Mills-Mackenzie, 14 Nov. 1828.

<sup>38</sup> MGUA, 447/28, Valade-Mills, 7 May 1829; 100/4, p. 175, Rev. J. Coghlan (Acting Secretary) - Valade, 11 Nov. 1829.

<sup>39</sup> MGUA, 447/28, Mackenzie-Mills, 12 Apr. 1829; 100/3, p. 115-116, Mills-Neagle, 4 Dec. 1826; 100/3, p. 116, Mills-Mackenzie, 4 Dec. 1826; for complete details of the Terrebonne situation see: BOULIANNE, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 322-368.

<sup>40</sup> MGUA, 100/2, p. 38-39, Mills-Alexander (concerning school at Eaton), 6 Sep. 1824; 100/2, p. 72-73, Mills-Abbott, 18 Dec. 1824; 100/4, p. 134-135, Mills-Black, 19 May 1829.

<sup>41</sup> MGUA, 447/4, Hennessy-[Mills], 17 Sep. 1822; 100/1 p. 160, Mills-Hennessy, 19 Sep. 1822; 100/1, p. 171, Mills-Hennessy, 19 Nov. 1822.

<sup>42</sup> MGUA, 447/7, Driscoll-John McConvill, 10 Oct. 1823; 100/2, p. 16-17, Mills-Driscoll, 14 Apr. 1824; 100/2, p. 17-18, Mills-James Cuthbert, 14 Apr. 1824.

<sup>43</sup> MGUA, 447/9, L. Montizambert (Acting Civil Secretary) - Mills, 28 July 1824.

<sup>44</sup> MGUA, 100/2, p. 31, Mills-Montizambert, 9 Aug. 1824; 447/10, Petition from Baie St. Paul to Lt. Gov. Sir F. N. Burton, 1 Nov. 1824; 100/2, p. 42, Mills-Montizambert, 11 Nov. 1824.

<sup>45</sup> MGUA, 100/2, p. 78-79, Mills-Christy, 13 Jan. 1825; 100/2, p. 111-112, Mills-L. Bélair and Geo. Chaperon, 7 Mar. 1825.



wanted him replaced by a Roman Catholic, Christy was released by the Royal Institution.<sup>46</sup> In Terrebonne it was Mills who had insisted that Vervais be replaced by a bilingual Roman Catholic.<sup>47</sup>

Only two English-speaking teachers are recorded as having clashed with the French-Canadian residents. Christy was one, and Christopher Purcell of Vaudreuil was the other. Both were released by Mills when complaints reached him. Purcell, whose services had been requested in a petition signed by curé Archambault among others,<sup>48</sup> became *persona non grata* in Vaudreuil very shortly after opening his school. He admitted to Mills of having had problems with the Catholic Church both in Ireland and in Vaudreuil, and that he had renounced his Catholic faith.<sup>49</sup> Without presenting the case to the Board, Mills offered Purcell a transfer to the Township of Kildare where the residents were Protestants.<sup>50</sup> These and the preceding examples show that the Board and the Secretary can hardly be accused of imposing English Protestant teachers upon the French Canadians.

The regulations of the Board stated further that the curés should be invited to become official visitors of the Royal Institution schools in their parishes. Mills expressed this more personally to a fellow Anglican, the Rev. J. Jackson of William Henry, in 1821:

I wish from my heart that they [the curés] would cordially cooperate with us throughout the Province in the advancement of Education instead of entertaining and fomenting such absurd and groundless jealousies as generally exist upon this.<sup>51</sup>

Furthermore, it is evident that the curés indeed had been invited to become visitors since early in 1822 the correspondence records numerous replies from curés refusing such appointments. Among these refusals were those of the following parish priests: Dénéchaud of Portneuf, Gatien of Cap Santé, Duranceau of Lachine, Viau of St. Nicolas, Raimbault of Nicolet and Drummondville, Brodeur of St. Roch, Painchaud of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, and St. Germain of Terrebonne.<sup>52</sup> Of course, St. Germain changed his mind later.

Mills stated the Royal Institution policy plainly in this matter in 1824 before the committee of the Assembly investigating education.

This *opposition*, or, if the term be preferred — this *non-co-operation* (for the effect is precisely the same) has been uniform and systematic, since

<sup>46</sup> MGUA, 447/12, Report, Baie St. Paul, 2 May 1825; 447/12, Chaperon-Mills, 5 May 1825; 100/2, p. 144-145, Mills-Bélair, 12 May 1825; 100/2, p. 144, Mills-Christy, 12 May 1825.

<sup>47</sup> MGUA, 100/3, p. 50-51, Mills-Mackenzie, 17 Apr. 1826.

<sup>48</sup> MGUA, 447/7, Petition, Vaudreuil, 8 Mar. 1824.

<sup>49</sup> MGUA, 447/21, Purcell-Mills, 7 Sep. 1827.

<sup>50</sup> MGUA, 447/21, Purcell-Mills, 7 Sep. 1827; Mills wrote this statement on the back of Purcell's letter.

<sup>51</sup> MGUA, 100/1, p. 33-35, Mills-Jackson, 20 Feb. 1821.

<sup>52</sup> MGUA, 447/3, Dénéchaud-[Mills], 6 Mar. 1822; 447/3, Gatien-Mills, 15 Mar. 1822; 447/3, J. Finlay (Lachine)-Mills, 12 June 1822; 447/8, Finlay-Mills,

the time that Monseigneur the Roman Catholic Bishop, declined becoming a Member of the Board. The name of one Solitary *curé* will be found on the list of visitors — one or two others, in the first instance, readily entered upon the task assigned them, but they were soon made sensible of their error, and had to retrace their steps in the best way they could — of the few who thought proper to notice the circular addressed to them by the Board, the answers, without stating any *specific* ground of objection or complaint, were couched in *general* terms, that, under present circumstances, they must decline taking any part in the superintendence of the schools in question — the observations, however, of one of the Roman Catholic Clergy — a gentleman of acknowledged talents, and I believe, a sincere friend to Education are worthy of remark, and I shall give them in his own words — “*Je me ferai un plaisir, même un devoir d’agir en conformité au 2e. article des reglements [sic], que vous avez eu la bonté de me transmettre à ce sujet, regrettant cordialement qu’il ne soit pas en mon pouvoir d’accepter la commission de visiteur avant que ces règlements [sic] soient fixés par une Loi, qui fait l’attente des ames sincerement [sic] libérales, et dont, j’en suis sur [sic], le Bureau lui même sent toute la convenance.*”<sup>53</sup>

Despite its stated policy and its invitations to parish priests to act as visitors, the Royal Institution was criticized, before that same committee of the Assembly in 1824, by Roman Catholic priests among others, for not allowing the Catholic clergy to visit its schools.<sup>54</sup> These testimonies were either less than honest, or made out of sheer ignorance of the facts.

Nevertheless, because of its lack of success in French-Canadian areas, and because of the criticism to which it was being subjected, in 1825, the Board petitioned the Crown to relieve it of its responsibilities towards the Roman Catholics in Lower Canada, and suggested that the authorities find some other way of providing for their education.

That they therefore pray Your Majesty to provide in such other manner as to Your Royal Wisdom shall seem best, for the general superintendence of the Education of Your Majesty’s Roman Catholic Subjects in the Country Parishes of this Province, and to extend your bounty for the extrication of your Petitioners from the state of embarrassment and destitution in which they are placed.<sup>55</sup>

The Board did not wait for an answer to its petition before taking indirect steps to get rid of its schools in French-Canadian areas. Merely on the strength that negotiations were in progress to form two independent committees of the Royal Institution, Mills began to refer problems coming from French-Canadian areas to the Roman Catholic Committee allegedly about to be formed. He did this in Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce (1826 and 1828), in Kamouraska (1828), in Vaudreuil (1827), in Portneuf

4 May 1824; 447/3, Viau-[Mills], 28 Feb. 1822; 447/3, Viau-Mills, 8 Mar. 1822; 447/3, Raimbault-Mills, 1 Feb. 1822; 447/3, Brodeur-[Mills], 17 Mar. 1822; 447/3, Painchaud-Mills, 15 Feb. 1822; 447/3, St. Germain-[Mills], 16 Feb. 1822.

<sup>53</sup> *JHALC*, Appendix A-Z, Vol. 33, 1823-1824, Appendix (Y), 25 Feb. 1824.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> PAC, Series “Q” 171, p. 74-75, Petition of the Royal Institution to the King, 26 Mar. 1825.

(1828), and in St. Roch (1828).<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, he acted in a similar manner after the Syndics' Act was passed in 1829. He referred Royal Institution schools in French-Canadian areas to the superior financial provisions of the new act. He did this in Kamouraska, Cap Santé and Terrebonne,<sup>57</sup> among other places. In a letter to G. W. Allsopp of Cap Santé, he made it very clear that the Royal Institution wanted to be rid of Roman Catholic schools entirely.<sup>58</sup> This attempt to relinquish its authority over these schools in the mid and late 1820's can hardly be described as the action of assimilators, particularly when placed in the total context of the policies of the central authorities of the Royal Institution.

If the situation at the central level of authority in the Royal Institution system had seemed at least theoretically and potentially dangerous for the French Canadians as far as assimilation through education was concerned, similarly, at the local level of authority, the situation theoretically did not seem much better. Because of the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy to the Royal Institution and the general non-cooperation of the great majority of the French Canadians to this system of education, an unduly high proportion of English-speaking local officials and teachers, approximately 50% in each case, were involved in the administration of the twenty-three schools defined as having a concentration of French-Canadian pupils and officials. However, in actual fact, the local authorities no more tried to use schools to assimilate the French Canadians than the central authorities had. The work of the school visitors and the clergymen must be examined in this context.

The visitors, local residents generally chosen from among those who had petitioned for the school, were commissioned formally through the Royal Institution. They were expected to make regular inspections and to report bi-annually to the Secretary of the Board. Needless to say, these visitors possessed a great deal of influence, but only in as much as they did not offend the majority of the parents and did not create a situation where people from the community at large would complain to the Board. In the twenty-three schools under consideration, this power had to be handled with particular discretion, especially in the light of the general opposition to Royal Institution schools throughout the province — and in some cases, of the opposition of the residents where these schools were located. (Refer to Table VII (A) — VII (E) for a distribution of the visitors in the twenty-three schools selected.)

<sup>56</sup> MGUA, 100/3, p. 111-112, Mills-A. C. Taschereau and François Lehoullier, 2 Dec. 1826; 100/3, p. 212, Mills-J. A. Philippon, 8 Jan. 1828; 100/4, p. 72-74, Mills-Pascal Taché, 12 Dec. 1828; 100/3, p. 149, Mills-Christopher Purcell, 8 Mar. 1827; 100/3, p. 219, Mills-Edward Hale, 12 Jan. 1828; 100/3, p. 235, Mills-Paul Bigué, 7 Feb. 1828; 100/4, p. 45, Mills-Lt. Col. J. B. Duchesnay, 18 Sep. 1828.

<sup>57</sup> MGUA, 100/4, p. 136, Mills-Taché and Dr. Thomas Horsman, 19 May 1829; 100/4, p. 144, Mills-G. W. Allsopp, 11 June 1829; 100/4, p. 149-150, Mills-Mackenzie, 23 June 1829.

<sup>58</sup> MGUA, 100/4, p. 144, Mills-Allsopp, 11 June 1829.

The distribution in Table VII (A) - VII (E) is a quantitative one. This distribution may be examined more subjectively by trying to assess the extent of leadership and influence of the English-speaking visitors. Table VIII represents such a subjective analysis based upon the degree of correspondence between the English-speaking visitors and the Secretary of the Board and by the influence of their recommendations with the Secretary.

Quantitatively, the English-speaking visitors represented approximately 50% of the total number in these schools. Qualitatively, they were the most influential officials again in approximately 50% of these schools. What real effect did this have on French-Canadian pupils? Apparently, very little. The visitors were generally most careful not to offend the French Canadians, and where the majority of the pupils were French-speaking, they tried to recommend French-speaking teachers. Furthermore, it must be kept in mind that they had to contend also with the known policies of the Board in this matter. The activities of some of these English-speaking visitors towards the French Canadians in their schools need to be examined.

Despite the conditions in Terrebonne and the influence of the English-speaking visitors, a French school had been in operation since 1814, and by 1829, it was in fact the curé, the Rev. Mr. St. Germain, who controlled the sole Royal Institution school. When Driscoll tried to interfere in Berthier, the teacher turned to the visitor James Cuthbert for help.<sup>59</sup> In Lachine, where all the visitors but one were English-speaking, they still sought the nomination of a bilingual teacher.<sup>60</sup> D. T. Jones, a bilingual Englishman, was appointed.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, despite curé Duranceau's activities against the Royal Institution — preaching against it from the pulpit and threatening a pupil with the withdrawal of the sacraments —<sup>62</sup> the visitors of Lachine nonetheless saw to it that the Roman Catholic pupils went to Duranceau's church for religious worship.<sup>63</sup> The principal visitors of Portneuf, Edward Hale, complained of the intolerance of the priests, of their indifference to education, and invited the Archdeacon of Quebec, the Rev. G. J. Mountain, and Mills to visit Portneuf to encourage the Protestant cause.<sup>64</sup> Despite this, the only two Royal Institution teachers who taught in Portneuf, Charles Desroches (1817-1822) and Olivier Aubry (1827-1829), were French-speaking. G. W. Allsopp, who controlled the Cap Santé school, complained similarly against the Roman Catholic clergy. He wrote to Mills in 1829:

I learn with great pain you are about leaving Canada; we want every member of the Church militant to combat against those who oppose

<sup>59</sup> MGUA, 447/5, Wolff-Cuthbert, 2 Jan. 1823; 100/2, p. 17-18, Mills-Cuthbert, 14 Apr. 1824.

<sup>60</sup> MGUA, 447/3, Finlay-Mills, 12 June 1822.

<sup>61</sup> MGUA, 100/1, p. 160, Mills-Finlay, 19 Sep. 1822.

<sup>62</sup> MGUA, 447/8, Finlay-Mills, 4 May 1824; 447/10, Finlay-Mills, 30 Nov. 1824.

<sup>63</sup> MGUA, 447/16, Report, Lachine, 6 May 1826.

<sup>64</sup> MGUA, 447/24, Hale-Mills, 24 Apr. 1828; 447/26, Hale-Mills, 20 Nov. 1828; 447/24, Hale-Mills, 24 June 1828.

protestant ascendancy, and none will more regret your absence than myself . . . .<sup>65</sup>

However, from 1822 to 1829, all the Cap Santé teachers were French-speaking: Charles Desroches (1822-1826), Joseph Marceau (1827-1828), Laurent C. A. de St. George (1828-1829). Furthermore, when only a Protestant teacher, Edward Thurber, was found to replace St. George temporarily, Allsopp was unwilling to recommend his appointment until all the parents with children in the school had agreed to it.<sup>66</sup> In Paspébiac (Gaspé), the principal visitor, J. Ferguson Winter, requested that Mills find them a bilingual teacher because of the large number of French Canadians in the area.<sup>67</sup> Later, when that bilingual teacher, Francis Le Brun, requested a transfer to New Carlisle, the visiting Anglican missionary, the Rev. Lucius Doolittle, advised Mills against the transfer because of the difficulty of finding another bilingual teacher for Paspébiac.<sup>68</sup> According to the documents examined, in none of the twenty-three schools under consideration could the leading English-speaking visitors be accused of encouraging activities that could have endangered the language and the faith of the French-Canadian pupils.

Ten Anglican clergymen visited five of these twenty-three schools (see Table IX). With the exception of the school at Pointe Lévi, all the others had large numbers of English pupils in regular attendance. For example, of the 342 pupils registered in the Montreal National School in 1824, 232 were Protestants.<sup>69</sup> No evidence was found to suggest that any of the clergymen who visited these schools had tried to proselytize the French-Canadian pupils. The only meddlesome Anglican clergyman had been Driscoll. Not only had Driscoll failed in Berthier (he never became officially a visitor), but he had failed also to establish Royal Institution schools in D'Aillebout, De Ramzay (County of Warwick), Rivière du Loup (County of St. Maurice), and Nicolet.<sup>70</sup> If this is a measure of the extent of Anglican interference among the French Canadians attending Royal Institution schools, there had not been that much to fear. In fact, only two religious conversions are recorded in all the documents of the 117 areas of Royal Institution activity from 1820 to 1829. In 1829, the Rev. S. S. Wood, Anglican clergyman of Three Rivers, reported to Mills that a French Canadian had been converted to Protestantism as a result of his study of Scriptures. However, there is no indication that this had had any connection with the Royal Institution

<sup>65</sup> MGUA, 447/28, Allsopp-Mills, 29 May 1829.

<sup>66</sup> MGUA, *Correspondence of the Royal Institution*, Allsopp-A. M. Macintosh (Acting Secretary), 18 Feb. 1831.

<sup>67</sup> MGUA, 447/9, Winter-Mills, 12 July 1824.

<sup>68</sup> MGUA, *Correspondence of the Royal Institution*, Doolittle-Mills, 12 May 1831.

<sup>69</sup> MGUA, 447/10, Report, Montreal National School, [15 Nov. 1824].

<sup>70</sup> MGUA, 447/17, Driscoll-Mills, 8 July 1826; 100/3, p. 212-213, Mills-Driscoll, 8 Jan. 1828; 447/24, Driscoll-Mills, 1 Apr. 1828; 100/3, p. 260-261, Mills-Driscoll, 5 Apr. 1828; 447/10, Driscoll-Mills, 27 Oct. 1824; 100/4, p. 61-62, Mills-Driscoll, 22 Nov. 1828; 447/7, Driscoll-Mills, 8 Mar. 1824; 447/14 [Driscoll]-Mills, 19 Oct. 1825; 100/3, p. 91-92, Mills-Driscoll, 31 Oct. 1826.

school.<sup>71</sup> This may have been Wood's way of retaliating against Abbé John Holmes who, three years earlier in Drummondville, had converted Wood's former clerk to Catholicism!<sup>72</sup>

The attitude of the curés towards the Royal Institution schools in their parishes was at best tolerant and at worst hostile. The actions of Duranceau of Lachine have been mentioned already, and there is some indirect evidence that the curés of St. Hilaire and Baie St. Paul interfered with the establishment of Royal Institution schools in their parishes.<sup>73</sup> However, a few priests showed some interest towards the Royal Institution even if they did not cooperate fully in its management: the Rev. Louis Lamothe of Berthier, the Rev. P. Archambault of Vaudreuil (at the beginning only), the Rev. M. Varin of Kamouraska, the Rev. C.-F. Painchaud of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, the Rev. Mr. Verrault of St. Thomas, the Rev. J.-A. Boisvert, missionary in Gaspé.<sup>74</sup> Very few gave really strong support to the Royal Institution, St. Germain of Terrebonne being one of the few exceptions.

Given the degree of freedom and flexibility left to the local authorities by the Board of Trustees and its Secretary, the curés could have had a great deal of influence over the Royal Institution schools in their parishes. However, the great majority chose not to get involved.

The distribution of teachers who taught in these twenty-three schools (see Table X A—X E) shows an even division between French and English-speaking teachers. The concentration of English-speaking teachers was in the Montreal area while that of French-speaking teachers was in the Quebec area. Furthermore, some of these English-speaking teachers were reputed to have had some degree of bilingualism: Jones of Lachine, LeBrun of Paspébiac, Baron Edmund E. de Koenig of L'Islet, and both Neagle and McDonald of Terrebonne. In addition, Neagle and McDonald were Roman Catholics.

A study of the influence of Royal Institution teachers in these schools is well beyond the scope of this paper since it would require a detailed analysis of the bi-annual reports and virtually a history of all Royal Institution activities in each of these areas. Furthermore, the correspondence of the Royal Institution would have to be supplemented by local sources. Audet did such a study of the schools in Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce

<sup>71</sup> MGUA, 447/27, Wood-Mills, 25 Mar. 1829.

<sup>72</sup> MGUA, 447/18, Driscoll-Mills, 21 Dec. 1826.

<sup>73</sup> MGUA, 447/8, A. Dumont, Philip Byrne, Lt. Col. J. B. H. de Rouville-Mills, 28 June 1824; 100/2, p. 36, Mills-de Rouville, 19 Aug. 1824; 447/12, Christy-Mills, 3 Apr. 1825; 447/12, Chaperon-Mills, 5 May 1825.

<sup>74</sup> MGUA, 447/4, statement by the Rev. L. Lamothe in favour of the teacher, Augustus Wolff, 21 Sep. 1822: this statement was enclosed in Wolff's letter to Mills, 447/4, 28 Sep. 1822; 447/7, Petition from Vaudreuil, 8 Mar. 1824; 447/3, Report, Kamouraska, 30 Mar. 1822; 447/3, Thomas Ansbrow-[Mills], 8 Apr. 1822; 447/3, Painchaud-Mills, 17 Jan. 1822; 447/1, J. Boisseau-Mills, 9 Nov. 1820; 447/28, Petition from Bonaventure (Gaspé), 23 Apr. 1829; 100/4, p. 143, Mills-Doolittle and Boisvert, 10 June 1829.

and Cap Santé.<sup>75</sup> I have done it for all the 117 areas of Royal Institution activities from 1820 to 1829 but based only on the Royal Institution documents.<sup>76</sup>

To conclude: the system of education established by the law of 1801, and the composition of the Board of Trustees in 1818 was hardly acceptable in a colony where the great majority of the population was French-speaking and Roman Catholic. Furthermore, there is no denying that the initiators of this law had considered seriously using education to attempt to assimilate the French Canadians. The latter had every right to try to alter this system to one more acceptable to their society. The Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Legislative Assembly both worked in their own ways towards this end. The Assembly succeeded in establishing a more equitable system of education when it passed the Syndics' Act in 1829.

However, one must distinguish between a system that was inequitable, in as much as it had placed central control of education in the hands of the colonial authorities and of the Anglican Church, and one which had been used allegedly to assimilate the French Canadians. From 1801 to 1818, there had been in fact no real system at all. When a system was established finally after 1818, its regulations were so liberal and its administration so flexible that a remarkable degree of local autonomy was obtained by the local authorities, including substantial opportunity for supervision by parish priests. The examination of data taken from among twenty-three schools with a concentration of French Canadians discloses nothing in the policies and administration of the central authorities or of the local officials (including some Anglican clergymen), to indicate that these schools had been used specifically to assimilate the French Canadians — quite the contrary. Given such a system, had they chosen to do so, the French Canadians could have taken control of education at the local level. Why they chose not to do so is another problem. Nevertheless, there is no evidence whatsoever to indicate that these schools had been used for anything but for the advancement of learning.

Table I

GOVERNMENT SUPPORTED SCHOOLS WITH  
FRENCH-CANADIAN CONCENTRATIONS IN 1818

<i>Schools *</i>	<i>Date founded **</i>
Terrebonne (French School Only)	1814
Montreal National School	1794
Lachine	1810
Berthier	1810
Three Rivers	1815

<sup>75</sup> Louis-Philippe AUDET, "Deux Ecoles royales, 1814-1836: Sainte-Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce et Cap-Santé", in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Third Series, Vol. L, June 1956, Section I, p. 7-24.

<sup>76</sup> BOULIANNE, *op. cit.*

Portneuf	1817
Cap Santé	1817
Pointe Lévi	1805
St. Nicolas	1816
Tilly or St. Antoine	1810
Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce	1814
St. Thomas (French School Only)	1807
Cap St. Ignace	1807
L'Islet	1810
St. Roch des Aulnais	1810
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière	1812
Kamouraska	1806

\* The information that the school was in operation in 1818 can be found in: *Journals of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada*, Vol. 28, 1819, Appendix (E), No. 13, Abstract of Warrants, 6 January — 2 November, 1818; these same records show also that in 1818 there were 37 schools in 35 areas supported by the government.

\*\* The date the school was founded is available in the *Journals of the House of Assembly*, and also in the *Correspondence of the Royal Institution*. There are sometimes minor conflicts between these two sources.

Table II

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTION  
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING IN 1818 \*

1. The Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada;
2. The Lord Bishop of Quebec;
3. Jonathan Sewell, Chief Justice, Lower Canada;
4. James Monk, Chief Justice, Court of the King's Bench, Montreal;
5. The Chief Justice of Upper Canada;
6. The Speaker of the Legislative Council, Lower Canada;
7. The Speaker of the House of Assembly, Lower Canada;
8. John Richardson, Executive Council, Lower Canada;
9. Ross Cuthbert, Executive Council, Lower Canada;
10. The Rev. John Strachan, Executive Council, Upper Canada.

\* This information is taken from: Louis-Philippe AUDET, *Le Système scolaire de la province de Québec*, Québec, les Presses universitaires Laval, 1952, Vol. III, p. 177.

Table III

NUMBER OF ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS: 1801-1846 \*

Date	Nos. of Schools	Date	Nos. of Schools
1801	4	1824	41
1802	5	1825	55
1803	7	1826	63
1804	7	1827	82
1805	7	1828	82
1806	9	1829	84
1807	12	1830	81
1808	14	1831	66
1809	13	1832	69
1810	15	1833	61
1811	19	1834	51
1812	25	1835	47



1813	26	1836	35
1814	29	1837	3
1815	29	1838	3
1816	32	1839	3
1817	34	1840	3
1818	35	1841	3
1819	37	1842	3
1820	36	1843	3
1821	36	1844	3
1822	26	1845	3
1823	29	1846	0

\* This information is taken from: Louis-Philippe AUDET, *Le Système scolaire de la province de Québec*, Québec, les Presses universitaires Laval, 1952, Vol. IV, p. 182.

Table IV

## FRENCH-CANADIAN SCHOOLS UNDER THE ROYAL INSTITUTION: 1818 \*

<i>School</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
1. St. François du Lac St. Pierre	François Annance
2. Pointe Lévi	François Malherbe
3. St. Louis de Kamouraska	Julien Perrault
4. Cap St-Ignace	Michel Perrault
5. St. Thomas	Antoine Côté
6. St. Antoine	Félix Victor
7. St. Roch	J.-Bte. L'Heureux
	Clément Cazeau
8. Terrebonne	Paul Joseph Gill **
	Augustin Vervais
9. Ste. Anne de la Pocatière	Robert Dupont
10. Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce	Joseph Philippon
11. Portneuf	Charles Desroches

\* Louis-Philippe AUDET, *Le Système scolaire de la province de Québec*, Québec, les Presses universitaires Laval, 1952, Vol. III, p. 136.

\*\* In fact, this was the English school of the Royal Institution in Terrebonne, and it appears as such in the correspondence of the Royal Institution. Augustin Vervais taught the French school.

Table V

DATE OF OPERATION OF ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS  
WITH FRENCH-CANADIAN CONCENTRATIONS, 1801-1829

## A. DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

<i>School</i>	<i>Dates of Operations *</i>
1. Vaudreuil (French school in the village of Vaudreuil)	1826-1827
2. Terrebonne (French and bilingual schools only)	1814-1829
3. St. Constant	1828-1829
4. Montreal National School	1794-1829
5. Lachine	1810-1829
6. St. Hilaire	1824
7. Berthier	1810-1823

B. DISTRICT OF THREE RIVERS

- |                                   |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| 8. Three Rivers                   | 1815-1829 |
| 9. St. François du Lac St. Pierre | 1803-1809 |

C. DISTRICT OF QUEBEC

- |                                      |                            |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 10. Portneuf                         | 1817-1822 and<br>1827-1829 |
| 11. Cap Santé                        | 1817-1829                  |
| 12. Pointe Lévi                      | 1805-1829                  |
| 13. St. Nicolas                      | 1816-1822                  |
| 14. Tilly or St. Antoine             | 1810-1821                  |
| 15. Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce | 1814-1828                  |
| 16. St. Thomas (French school only)  | 1807-1829                  |
| 17. Cap St. Ignace                   | 1807-1822                  |
| 18. L'Islet                          | 1810-1822                  |
| 19. St. Roch des Aulnais             | 1810-1826                  |
| 20. Ste. Anne de la Pocatière        | 1812-1823                  |
| 21. Kamouraska                       | 1806-1825                  |
| 22. Baie St. Paul                    | 1824-1825                  |

D. DISTRICT OF GASPÉ

- |               |           |
|---------------|-----------|
| 23. Paspébiac | 1824-1829 |
|---------------|-----------|

\* In the various tables, the terminal date 1829 does not imply that Royal Institution activities ceased in these areas at that time, but only that for the purposes of this paper, they are not considered beyond that date.

Table VI

LIST OF SOME OF THE FRENCH TEXTBOOKS USED IN  
ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS \*

L'instruction de la jeunesse;  
Abécédaire critique et morale;  
Grammaire, par L'Homond;  
Grammaire française et anglaise, par Chambaud;  
Syllabaire français et anglais, par Porney;  
Le grand alphabet français;  
Méthode pour bien lire et orthographier, par Jean Plairet;  
Lecture française, par Lindley Murray;  
Le nouveau pensez-y-bien;  
Arithmétique, par Bibaud;  
Arithmétique, par Bouthillier;  
Petit manuel du chrétien;  
L'histoire abrégée de l'ancien testament;  
Imitation de Jésus Christ;  
Le nouveau testament;  
Le catéchisme du diocèse de Québec;  
Histoire générale de l'univers;  
Éléments de la langue latine, par L'Homond;  
Télémaque.

\* These books are found in the various visitors' reports, in the *Correspondence of the Royal Institution*.

Table VII

VISITORS IN ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS  
WITH FRENCH-CANADIAN CONCENTRATIONS, 1801-1829

A. DISTRICT OF MONTREAL			
<i>School</i>	<i>Nos. of Visitors</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>English</i>
Vaudreuil	9	6	3
Terrebonne	11	8	3
St. Constant	2	2	—
Montreal National School	6	—	6
Lachine	8	1	7
St. Hilaire	1	1	—
Berthier	3	1	2
Total	40	19	21
B. DISTRICT OF THREE RIVERS			
Three Rivers	7	2	5
St. François du Lac St. Pierre	—	(no records available)	—
Total	7	2	5
C. DISTRICT OF QUEBEC			
Portneuf	3	2	1
Cap Santé	5	4	1
Pointe Lévi	8	3	5
St. Nicolas	5	2	3
Tilly or St. Antoine	—	(no records available)	—
Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce	3	3	—
St. Thomas	3	3	—
Cap St. Ignace	2	2	—
L'Islet	3	3	—
St. Roch des Aulnais	3	3	—
St. Anne de la Pocatière	2	1	1
Kamouraska	5	4	1
Baie St. Paul	2	1	1
Total	44	31	13
D. DISTRICT OF GASPÉ			
Paspébiac	8	1	7
E. SUMMARY			
<i>District</i>	<i>Nos. of Visitors</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>English</i>
Montreal	40	19	21
Three Rivers	7	2	5
Quebec	44	31	13
Gaspé	8	1	7
Total	99	53	46

Table VIII

INFLUENTIAL ENGLISH-SPEAKING VISITORS IN  
ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS  
WITH FRENCH-CANADIAN CONCENTRATIONS, 1801-1829

<i>School</i>	<i>Visitors</i>
Terrebonne	The Seigneur, the Hon. Roderick Mackenzie; Dr. Simon Fraser.
Montreal National School	Rev. John Bethune; Rev. B. B. Stevens; both of the Church of England.
Lachine	Rev. B. B. Stevens; Joshua Finlay.
Berthier	The Seigneur, Lt.-Col. James Cuthbert.
Three Rivers	Because of apparent differences between the people and the Anglican clergymen, no visitor seemed in a position of leadership. The teacher, Selby Burn, seemed to be the most influential person in the school.
Portneuf	Edward Hale.
Cap Santé	G. W. Allsopp.
Pointe Lévi	Rev. R. R. Burrage, an Anglican clergyman; master of the Royal Grammar School at Quebec; future Secretary of the Royal Institution.
Kamouraska	Dr. Thomas Horsman.
Paspébiac	J. Ferguson Winter and a succession of Anglican missionaries: Rev. Richard Knagg; Rev. William Hough; Rev. William Arnold; Rev. Lucius Doolittle.

Table IX

ANGLICAN CLERGYMEN WHO VISITED ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS  
WITH FRENCH-CANADIAN CONCENTRATIONS, 1801-1829

<i>School</i>	<i>Anglican Clergymen</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
Montreal National School	Rev. John Bethune; Rev. B. B. Stevens	Regular visitors
Lachine	Rev. B. B. Stevens	Regular visitor
Three Rivers	Rev. R. Q. Shortt; Rev. S. S. Wood; Rev. Francis Evans	Signed reports separately from other visitors
Pointe Lévi	Rev. R. R. Burrage	Regular visitor
Paspébiac	Rev. Richard Knagg; Rev. W. Hough; Rev. W. Arnold; Rev. L. Doolittle	As missionaries, only casual visitors

Table X

TEACHERS IN ROYAL INSTITUTION SCHOOLS  
WITH FRENCH-CANADIAN CONCENTRATIONS, 1801-1829

A. DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

<i>School</i>	<i>Total Nos. of Teachers</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>English</i>
Vaudreuil (French school only)	1	—	1
Terrebonne (Three schools)	7	2	5
St. Constant	1	1	—
Montreal National School	4	—	4
Lachine	2	—	2
St. Hilaire	1	1	—
Berthier	1	—	1
Total	17	4	13

B. DISTRICT OF THREE RIVERS

Three Rivers	1	—	1
St. François du Lac St. Pierre	1	1	—
Total	2	1	1

C. DISTRICT OF QUEBEC

Portneuf	2	2	—
Cap Santé	5	3	2
Pointe Lévi	3	3	—
St. Nicolas	1	1	—
Tilly or St. Antoine	1	1	—
Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce	1	1	—
St. Thomas (French school only)	1	1	—
Cap. St. Ignace	1	1	—
L'Islet	1	—	1
St. Roch des Aulnais	2	2	—
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière	1	1	—
Kamouraska	4	1	3
Baie St. Paul	1	—	1
Total	24	17	7

D. DISTRICT OF GASPÉ

Paspébiac	1	—	1
-----------	---	---	---

E. SUMMARY

<i>District</i>	<i>Total Nos. of Teachers</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>English</i>
Montreal	17	4	13
Three Rivers	2	1	1
Quebec	24	17	7
Gaspé	1	—	1
Total	44	22	22