The establishment of industrial education in Canada illustrates clearly the close relationship between educational change and broader social reform. Canadian historians, in general, have placed this movement in two contexts: as the educational expression of the Dominion's national development policy, and as a step closer to the egalitarian ideal of universal, state-supported, compulsory public schooling. The present study suggests a counter-argument: that industrial education programmes emerged as one facet of an urban-based, conservative social reform movement which held as its twin concerns the creation of controls over potential sources of social disorder and the regulation of the relationship between labour and the economy.

REFORM AS SOCIAL TRACKING: THE CASE OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION IN ONTARIO 1870-1900

T.R. MORRISON

The industrial education movement in Canada has been assessed by historians in two ways: as the educational expression of the Dominion's national development policy, and as an important step closer to the egalitarian ideal of universal, state-supported compulsory schooling.[1] Each interpretation marries industrial education to cherished social values: for the former, economic growth and the latter, equality of opportunity. The present study, based on an analysis of the group support and social functions associated with attempts to introduce various forms of industrial education, poses a counter-argument: that industrial education programs surfaced as one facet of an urban-centered, conservative, social reform movement which encompassed, as one of its vital concerns, the establishment of controls over the character, behavior and occupational future of poor and delinquent children.[2] As such, industrial education was more a bane, than a boon, to the working class.

T.R. Morrison is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Manitoba, co-editor of *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education* (Holt-Rinehart Winston 1973), and Director of Social Concerns and Curriculum Development Project, Manitoba.

[1]See R. M. Stamp, "The Campaign for Technical Education in Ontario" (London, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1970); R.M. Stamp "Industrialization and Secondary School Curriculum Reform" in R. Heyman, R. Lawson and R. Stamp, *Studies in Educational Change* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972); G. M. Fleming, *Schools - Pupils and Teachers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), R. Harris, *The Quiet Evolution* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967) and C. E. Phillips, *The Development of Education in Canada* (Toronto: Gage, 1957).

[2]This relationship between educational change and social reform is documented in T. R. Morrison, "The Child and Late Nineteenth Century Urban Social Reform in Ontario" (Toronto, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, 1971)

In late nineteenth century Ontario, the term industrial education was used to describe what, in fact, were two on-going approaches. Initially, industrial education referred to a combination of practical training and character building given to poor and delinquent children within a semi-private industrial school. Later, industrial education was synonymous with manual training, a study program within the public school curriculum obstensibly geared to teaching those mechanical skills and trades practised within industry. Both forms of industrial education, however, operated as the educational equivalent of poor relief. In this regard, industrial schools and manual training functioned in a dual capacity: as a mute for potential sources of social disorder and a regulator of labor by reinforcing the work norms and character ideals of the factory. As poor relief, industrial education provided a surrogate system of social control, particularly during periods in which the market seemed incapable of regulating human behavior. The effects of the social control function of industrial education, moreover, transcended the fostering of factory work norms. For industrial education programs also contributed to the definition and enforcement of the terms on which different classes performed different types of work. It supplied, in fact, one of the first formal educational tracking systems allocating poor, delinquent and Indian children to work roles which guaranteed them an inferior status and material living standard. In this way, industrial education sustained basic social and economic inequities.

I

The beginnings of industrial education in Ontario can be found in attempts to combat and control pauperism and crime among urban children. During the 1860's many people were alarmed by the apparent upsurge in the numbers of vagrant and delinquent children, many of whom roved the streets in gangs. Of particular concern, was the potential of such "dangerous classes" for crime and delinquency. Jail statistics, in fact, reinforced this fear. From 1860 - 1864, nearly six hundred male and female children under the age of sixteen were committed to the Toronto jail.[3] To many people, education or lack of it provided both a reason for the "child problem" as well as an approach to its solution. "Often filthy and unwholesome in appearance and ragged in clothing," noted Egerton Ryerson in describing the plight of vagrant children, "they are rarely to be found in the clean and orderly ranks of our schools."[4] Increasingly, the "child on the street" was cited as an indicator of the failure of the idea of free education itself. "It was mainly with the view of reaching the depraved and dangerous classes of the community," declared the *Canadian Churchman*, that the "respectable inhabitants of this city consented to be taxed so largely — it was thought that the common schools being made free, these Arabs of the streets would be induced to attend."[5] Disenchantment with

[3]"Vagrant Children in our Cities", *The Journal of Education for Upper Canada*, January, 1866, No. 1, p. 4.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 5.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 5.

the common school as a preventer of juvenile crime and vagrancy generated arguments in support of the establishment of a more specialized institution through which to attack the problem. "It is to be earnestly hoped that some attempt may be made to work downward to reach the grade of children, apparently below the influence of our present system," commented Ryerson, "to gather them in their rags and squalor (if necessary) apart from those of their own age who shrink from their contact."[6]

The apparent need of a more specialized education for young urban vagrants and delinquents spawned definite action in 1868. A small group of Torontonians, spearheaded by such prominent men as Judge Hagarty, Professor Daniel Wilson and W. B. McMurrich, met several times in the Spring of that year "to consider the advisability of providing education for those children now outside the pale of our school system." The outcome of these discussions was a detailed and wide-ranging proposal for the creation of a set of industrial schools. Unlike the Boys and Girls Homes which catered primarily to destitute and neglected pauper children "not convicted of crime" or the juvenile reformatory, the industrial school would accomodate those street children "not so destitute as to render it desirable or possible to remove them from their parents, who nevertheless are growing up in ignorance and lapsing into crime."[7] The industrial school was not to be a substitute for the family, but a complementary appendage to it arming vagrant children with the moral habits absent in their homes. Once admitted to the industrial school, it was anticipated that the child would function as a "domestic missionary" towards his own parents: "to carry home healthful influence, in many cases into haunts of vice and depravity."[8]

The projected plan of this Industrial Schools Committee transcended a mere recommendation for a new type of school: it reflected, in many ways, a perspective of the affluent and higher ranking members of society on the social functions of education. The guiding premise of the Industrial School Committee's position was an interpretation of the *raison d'être* of free schooling itself: "the institution of Free Common Schools in the city of Toronto, open to all children of all citizens, involves clear recognition of the principle that they are specially designed to meet the case of the poorest classes."[9] To people like Judge Hagarty, Professor Wilson and W. D. McMurrich, however, vagrant children, rising juvenile crime rates and less than adequate school attendance suggested strongly that the promise of the free school was as yet unfulfilled. The direction of reform seemed clear:

> some organization is required for securing their attendance at school and their ob-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[7] "Industrial Schools", *Journal of Education for Upper Canada*, April, 1868, p. 63. For a description of the Boys and Girls' Homes, see Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 1861, No. 24, p. 1. A similar discussion for the boys Reformatory can be found in Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 1863, No. 66, p. 1.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

[9] "Industrial Schools, Toronto", *The Journal of Education for Upper Canada*, June, 1868, p. 93.

> taining the benefit of such training as will fit them to become industrious members of the community, instead of passing from a condition of vagrancy and incipient vice into the ranks of the depraved and criminal class which furnishes the costly occupants of our reformatories and gaols.[10]

Philanthropy and crime prevention were not the only reasons offered by the committee in support of the industrial school. Economic considerations, as in all of late nineteenth century social reform, also played a central role. "The mere annual addition of one or two hundred industrious members to our community," noted the committee, "would, in itself be a great gain."[11] Not only did the community suffer from the unused capacity of youthful labor, but it also bore the expense of "criminal courts, gaols, police and other punitive or protective machinery, rendered needful for the protection of the community from their depredations and violence." "Reclaiming any portion of this ignorant and vicious class", declared the Industrial Schools Committee, would be "more than equivalent to an addition of double the number of industrious immigrants."

Acknowledging a public responsibility for the eradication of vagrancy and delinquency among children, the Industrial Schools Committee introduced a plan involving a mixture of voluntary and public action. The city school trustees, according to the proposal, would furnish one or more special schools on condition that the Committee, through voluntary subscription, provided finances for the salary of the matron and meals for the children. The Committee also proposed to help find permanent employment for the children, "if possible, in the country beyond the reach of city temptations". As a step toward effective reform, the Committee stressed the need to directly involve a group of "benevolent young ladies" in the program of the school. "The radical source of juvenile depravity", noted the Committee, "is in the want of healthy home influences — to many of the vagrant children the idea of parental authority or domestic restraint is associated with drunkeness, brutal violence and profanity". Through a deliberate application of the soothing influence of respectable motherhood, the Industrial Schools Committee, like other reformers of the period, hoped to awaken the dormant goodness and virtue they believed resided within every child.

Since lack of satisfactory school attendance was seen as a major source of the "child problem", the Industrial Schools Committee issued recommendations in this direction. Although the Committee accepted the idea that "compulsory attendance is a logical sequence of compulsory taxation for the free education of all classes", and believed also that ultimately nothing short of stringent enforcement of such a legal obligation would eliminate the current malaise among urban children, it still appeared "premature and ineffective as a means of meeting the wants of the unfortunate

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 93. For a discussion of school attendance in the period see Haley Bamman, "Patterns of School Attendance in Toronto; 1844 - 1878: Some Spatial Considerations", *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. XII, No. 3, Fall, 1972, pp. 381 - 410.

class of children." Forcing such children to attend common schools would deprive their families, dissipated and unhealthy as they were, of actual or potential sources of subsistence. Regular provision of food, systematic moral instruction, and industrial training offered in a segregated industrial school, on the other hand, would bring immediate benefits to both the family and society. To attend to those children who persisted "in idling on streets during school hours," the Committee sugested the appointment of a truant officer who, in co-operation with YM-YWCA workers and city missionaries, could "gather in the wanderers who are now perishing in our midst for lack of knowledge."[12]

In the early summer of 1868, the Industrial Schools Committee forwarded its plan, along with details of anticipated expediture, to the Board of School Trustees of the City of Toronto. The preliminary estimate of the Committee was for one hundred children at a cost of $2,535.00, to be collected through voluntary subscription. Upon receipt of the proposal, the Board established a sub-committee to consider its feasibility and make recommendations on possible action. The report of this sub-committee, quickly adopted by the Board, sparked a heated controversy between the Industrial Schools Committee and the Board of Trustees. Although it recognized the need for swift action on the vagrant child problem, and even the potential effectiveness of an industrial school, the Board of Trustees rejected the plan of the Industrial Schools Committee. Two reasons were offered in justification of this decision: the "practical" difficulties entailed in a voluntary system of financing the costs of food and lodging and the Board's suspicion that many of the vagrant children were Catholics and, thus, the responsibility of the separate school trustees or the Catholic clergy.[13]

The school trustees bolstered their decision with a counter proposal to the Industrial Schools Committee intended to isolate "those indispensable considerations" requisite to the development of industrial schools. Operating such schools on a daytime basis only, as the Industrial Schools Committee suggested, argued the trustees, would substantially neutralize their deterrent and reformative impact. Efficiency in reform required institutional isolation: the "entire separation, through night as well as day, of those juvenile vagrants from all association with the corrupt sources in which they are surrounded."[14] The Board of Trustees, for these reasons, rejected the Committees' more moderate, family-based concept in favor of a wholly institutionalized approach to reform. A second consideration cited by the trustees was the need for a more general system of compulsory school attendance. This proposal, however, required legislative action by the

[12]*Ibid.*, p. 93.

[13]The legacy of anti-Catholicism and the bitterness it engendered in education, is noted in Haley Bamman, "Patterns of School Attendance in Toronto 1844 -1878: Some Spatial Considerations", *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 12, No. 3, 1972, p. 395. See also Franklin Walker, *Catholic Politics and Education in Ontario* (Toronto: J.M. Dent, 1962).

[14]"Toronto Boys' Industrial Schools" *Journal of Education for Upper Canada*, 1868, p. 95.

Provincial Government, for neither city authorities nor local school trustees possessed the power to enact such a law. Accordingly, the school trustees urged the Industrial Schools Committee to seek the necessary action at the provincial level.

The Industrial Schools Committee greeted the report of the school trustees with a combination of regret and concern. "It is to be regretted," lamented the Committee, that the "Board did not see fit to afford the deputation an opportunity of conferring with them on the subject before adopting the report."[15] Beyond the absence of consultation, the Industrial Schools Committee challenged the trustees' position that the proposed plan was not feasible. In response to the trustees' insistence regarding the impracticality of a voluntary plan, the Committee pointed to the successful operation of a similar model in Dr. Guthrie's Ragged School in Edinburgh. To test the validity of the trustees' second objection — the problems connected with an apparently high percentage of Catholics among the vagrant children — the Industrial Schools Committee sponsored a rather unique experiment. In co-operation with the Toronto YMCA, they provided an evening of entertainment for local "City Arabs". Upwards of two hundred boys were in attendance. Once there, the Industrial Schools Committee surveyed the group to determine their religion and degree of literacy. The findings of this survey indicated that over one half of the group was Protestant and but a handful were able to read or write. It appeared obvious to the Committee that "there is abundant legitimate work for school trustees."[16] Finally, the Industrial Schools Committee objected vigorously to the trustees' leaning toward a completely institutionalized strategy in reform. Such an approach, they noted, would destroy the use of children as family missionaries, as well as unfairly discriminate against parents who "while occasionally drunk, were not as yet so vicious as to justify forcible removal of their children from them."[17]

In its closing statement on the trustees' report, the Industrial Schools Committee affirmed its conviction that the school system, through the Board of Trustees of the city, was still the legitimate and most effective vehicle for dealing with vagrant and delinquent children. To this end, it acted on one of the trustees' suggestions and petitioned the Provincial Government to consider, in its current revision of the School Law, the addition of powers for Boards of School Trustees to establish industrial schools for children under fourteen years of age. The petition of the Industrial Schools Committee was presented to the Provincial Government by three of the most influential members of the group: J. G. Hodgins, Deputy Minister of Education, Professor Daniel Wilson, and Reverend Thomas Fuller, Archdeacon of Niagara. Not surprisingly, the petition led to an amendment in the 1871 School Act which empowered school boards

[15]"Our Juvenile Vagrants", *Journal of Education for Upper Canada,* 1868, p. 185.

[16]*Ibid.*, p. 185.

[17]R. Splane, *Social Welfare in Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965). p. 74.

to establish industrial schools for "otherwise neglected children". Once again the Toronto School Board took up the issue of industrial schools appointing a special committee to study the operation of similar schools, in the United States. In its report, the committee expressed support for such schools, but argued, in addition, that extra financial aid would be needed to defray the costs of those services beyond purely formal instruction. Any action by the school board, concluded the committee, should await definite provincial policy on the whole question of industrial schools.

Certain of the difficulties noted by the Toronto School Board were removed in 1874, by the new Industrial Schools Act. The new statute — the Provincial Government's response to continual pressure from the Industrial Schools Committee and the unsolved problem of school attendance — gave formal definition to an industrial school as an institution "in which industrial training is provided and in which children are lodged, clothed, fed, as well as taught."[18] Boards of both public and separate schools obtained the right to found industrial schools; a reaction, no doubt, to the earlier controversy over the religion of the vagrant child. Although the Act placed the operation of industrial schools under regular provincial inspection, and subjected it to "the same legislation", direct provincial financial aid was not provided.[19]

The Industrial Schools Act restricted admission to industrial schools to children under fourteen years of age who, at the discretion of a police magistrate, satisfied one of the following conditions:

1. Found begging or receiving alms or being in any street or public place for the purpose of begging;
2. Found wandering and not having any home or settled place of abode or proper guardianship, or not having any lawful occupation or business or visible means of subsistence;
3. Found destitute, either being an orphan or having a surviving parent who is undergoing penal servitude or imprisonment;
4. Whose parent, step-parent or guardian represents to the police magistrate that he is unable to control the child and that he desires the child to be sent to an industrial school under this act;
5. Who, by reason of the neglect, drunkenness or other vices of parents, is suffered to be growing up without solitary parental control and education, or in circumstances exposing him to lead an idle and dissolute life.

The regulation in the Act regarding the conditions of attendance was a

[18]Ontario, *Statutes*, 1874 (First Session), C. 29.

[19]The Act did provide, however, that "in case any money is granted or provided by the Legislature for the support of industrial schools, it shall be the duty of the Chief Superintendent. . . to apportion the money . . . to the several industrial schools in the province."

compromise of the positions advocated by the Industrial Schools Committee and the Board of School Trustees. Full time attendance was desired, but provision existed for a child to "live at the dwelling of any trustworthy and respectable persons." Exclusion of convicted offenders from the ranks of those eligible to attend the industrial school, moreover, distinguished that institution from the reformatory. At the same time, the clear delineation of the target group as basically vagrant, destitute, neglected or homeless children marked off the industrial school from the common school.

The conditions in the Act governing admission, detention and release of children represented a tacit acceptance of the idea of an industrial school as a reform appendage to the family. Parents, for example, might recommend to police magistrates the admission of their children to the industrial school. Police magistrates and the Chief Superintendent of Schools, however, possessed almost complete discretionary powers over discharge of children from the industrial school. School boards could also release a child to his parents, if it was demonstrated "that the parents have reformed and are leading orderly and industrious lives and are in a condition to exercise salutary parental control over their children and to provide them with proper education and employment."

Despite the clear legislative mandate in the 1874 Act, school boards displayed remarkable reluctance in moving to establish industrial schools. The financial burdens anticipated in such enterprises undoubtedly were cause for hesitation. Even more important, however, was the unwillingness of school boards, as agencies of the state, to disturb the sanctity of the family by interfering with parental rights over children. For example, as late as 1886, J.J. Kelso, a pioneer in the "child-saving" movement in Ontario, testified to the "power of parenthood" in affecting court judgements. In attempting to secure a degree of protection for two young "street beggars," Kelso recalled his frustration:

> It took . . . three hours to find a charitable institution to take them in for the night, and when next morning came, the parents were charged in the Police Court with gross neglect. The magistrate dismissed the case on the grounds that parents could do as they liked with their children.[20]

State agencies might have been unsure of their role in family life, but many voluntary reform associations were not. The extension of state authority over children, and its accompanying regulation of family life—so characteristic of late nineteenth century Ontario — was built on earlier activity at the voluntary level.[21] City missionaries, YM - YWCA workers, prisoner aid groups, social workers, philanthropic agencies, sanitary reformers and sunday school teachers; all practised their altruistic trades within the homes of the poor. To facilitate this voluntary initiative, and channel part of it toward the unfulfilled objectives of the 1874 Act, the Provincial Government, in 1884, amended the Industrial Schools Act to

[20]J. J. Kelso, *Early History of the Humane and Child-Saving Movement* (Toronto: King's Printer, 1911), p. 35.

[21]This process is documented more fully in T.R. Morrison, *op. cit.*

permit Boards of School Trustees to delegate their "powers, rights and privileges" over industrial schools to any incorporated philanthropic society.[22] At the same time, juvenile delinquents — that is children "who have been found guilty of petty crime" — were added to the list of eligible recruits to the industrial school.

Shortly following the passage of the 1884 amendment, a voluntary reform group, known as the Industrial Schools Association of Toronto, surfaced and renewed the fight for industrial schools. The social background and occupational rank of this group was similar to that of the earlier Industrial Schools Committee: a mixture of business men, academics, civil servants and churchmen. If there was a difference between the two groups, it lay in the higher proportion of businessmen in the new Industrial Schools Association: a pattern indicative of a growing concern among social reformers to introduce efficiency and organization into their social service.[23] In 1887, the Industrial Schools Association established its first school for boys at Mimico. The corporate administrative structure of the school reflected the social viewpoint of its founders: a board of governors set policy and acquired financial support; a Superintendent administered the will of the board and a series of matrons took charge of the moral instruction and religious training. Of the first fifty boys admitted to the school, twenty five were sent on the specific request of parents and guardians.[24] The remaining twenty five were sentenced by magistrates under the categories of vagrancy, drunkenness and theft.

Prior to its formal operation, the Association considered two alternate program models for the school. The congregate system, founded on the organizational principles of the penitentiary, but lacking its stern discipline, appealed to the association members' desire for economies of scale. Extensive plant resources, detailed classification systems, a formal battery of rules and a wide range of industrial and shop labour combined in the congregate system to offer the possibility of obtaining a "great diminution of juvenile crime and evil influence."[25] The Industrial Schools Association, committed as they were to a more natural, family-based approach to reform, rejected a complete congregate system as a method which would overly "institutionalize" the child. Instead, they turned to what was known as the "family plan" as the most unconstrained setting in which to secure the necessary moral reform and industrial training of vagrant and delinquent children. Under the family plan, inmates lived in a series of detached cottages supervised by a matron who functioned as a surrogate parent to the children. According to the newly appointed Superintendent of

[22]Ontario, *Statutes*, 1884, C. 46.

[23]See T.R. Morrison, *op. cit.*, R. Wiebe, *The Search for Order* (N.Y.: Hill-Wang, 1967), and Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist* (N.Y.: Random House, 1966).

[24]The reason offered by most parents was that their children were "uncontrollable" or "drifting toward crime".

[25]W. B. McMurrich, "Industrial Schools", *Canadian Monthly*, November, 1872, p. 425.

Alexandria Industrial School, "our aim is to conduct it on the family plan — that plan which was divinely constituted and which God has shown in an infinity of ways to be the highest, holiest and most powerful instrument in the moral, intellectual and religious training of children."[26] Cottage mothers, in their interactions with the children, fostered the values of punctuality, self-restraint, regularity, piety and respect for manual labour. Proper conduct by children received the highest of rewards: "affection from the house mother."[27]

A closer inspection of the relationship between the intentions of the Industrial Schools Association and their consequent actions reveals the irony of most late nineteenth century social reform. Although the declared purpose of the cottage system was to have "home feeling restored and implanted in the breast of each boy," the association designed the cottages to accommodate fifty boys. Gradually, questions of organization, management, efficient utilization of staff time and discipline over-shadowed concern about establishing a family atmosphere. The formal school program also demonstrated the inconsistency of industrial school reform. By far the largest percentage of time in the industrial school was spent acquiring respect for the work norms and rule of the factory, rather than in academic education or formal skill training.[28] Under the paternalistic wing of the new breed of reform managers, the factory rather than the family — idealized as its conception may have been among reformers — emerged as the governing model of the industrial school.[29] Standardized work patterns, reward systems related to production tasks, competition in the quantity of production and punitive authority — all characteristics of the late nineteenth century factory — could be found in the industrial school. The importance of this shift from family to factory as models for industrial schools cannot be over-emphasized. For when educators generated their conceptions of manual training, school shops and technical education, they wasted little time discussing a "family plan" and turned almost automatically toward the factory for their inspiration.

The founding of Alexandria Industrial School, and later its equivalent for girls, Victoria Industrial School, symbolized one of Ontario's first formal commitments to the idea of industrial education. In many ways, the development of industrial schools established a framework for subsequent efforts to introduce manual training, school shops and technical education. This framework encompassed four dimensions of industrial education: purpose, program, organizational structure and formative pro-

[26]Industrial Schools Association of Toronto, *Annual Report*, 1893, p. 10.

[27]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

[28]See R. S. Splane, *Social Welfare in Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965) p. 253.

[29]The idealized concept of the family and its relationship to social reform and education is discussed in T. R. Morrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 - 75; and see also Alison Prentice, "Education and the Metaphor of the Family: The Upper Canada Example", *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 3, Fall 1972, pp. 281 - 303.

cess. The avowed purpose of the industrial school, to its advocates, was two-fold: the prevention and control of incipient social disorder and the regulation and utilization of unused labor capacity. To further this end, the program designed in industrial schools was built upon a combination of simulated factory conditions and direct moral training. To the same end, industrial schools were segregated, in terms of physical location, clientele and institutional structure, from the educational and social mainstream. The entire process by which industrial schools were founded and organized, moreover, was class-based: it involved an idea developed by the more affluent and socially powerful groups, aimed at the poor and working classes and backed eventually by the power and authority of the state. The interests, aspirations or material peril of the poor, when accounted for at all, were weighed against the self-interested perspective of these more powerful groups. As the industrial education movement expanded to encompass the public schools, the themes surrounding the industrial school — social control, labor regulation, moral character training and class interest — played central roles.

II

Ontario educators witnessed a first hand demonstration of the growing importance of manual training concepts in industrial education in 1876 at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. The various exhibits and displays in the Exposition stressed a common theme: the tightening dependence of industrial development and national power upon a continuous application of science and technology to the production process.[30] On these grounds, the United States and Russia emerged from the Exposition as recognized contenders in the international race for power and prestige. Ontario also won accolades, particularly for its educational exhibit. According to the *Toronto Mail*, Ontario's display of object teaching, kindergarten methods and educational appliances "took the shine out of them all."[31]

George Hodgins, Deputy Minister of Education and Ontario's representative at the Exposition, returned from Philadelphia firmly convinced of the need to introduce manual training into the public school system. To further this goal, Hodgins launched a propaganda tour across the Province. The lesson of the Exposition for Canadians, argued Hodgins, was the implication that, in future, national survival would depend on the ability to generate increasing quantities of skilled manpower for industry. In a special report to the Minister of Education, Hodgins warned of the dangers inherent in Ontario's over-reliance on the importation of skilled workers from the United States and Europe:

> While we have liberally provided for the other wants of our people we have almost entirely neglected making suitable provision in the schools for training, and then turning

[30]See Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (N.Y: Random House, 1964), pp. 1 - 75.

[31]*Toronto Mail*, May 15, 1876, p. 2.

> to practical account, that superior scientific and industrial skill among ourselves which in other countries contributes so largely and effectively to develop their physical and industrial resources. The remarkable . . . development among ourselves of the manufacturing interests of the country . . . has reached a magnitude and importance such that it would be suicidal to those interests (in these days of keen competition with our American neighbours) and injurious to their proper development, not to provide, without delay, for the production of a class of skilled machinists, manufacturers, engineers, chemists and others. No one can visit any of the industrial centers which have sprung up in our larger towns without being struck with their value and importance and the number and variety of the skilled labourers employed. Inquiry into the source of supply of this industrial class reveals the fact that we are almost entirely indebted to England, Ireland, Scotland and the United States for that supply.[32]

Hodgin's campaign to introduce manual training into the public schools was unsuccessful. Yet, he had forcefully suggested that the relationship between productive efficiency and schooling would be an issue of abiding concern from that point onward.

Throughout the late nineteenth century, Ontario recorded a continuous growth in productivity. The largest share of this increased productivity, in terms of both employment and percent of the Gross National Product, was generated by an expansion in the scale and output of manufacturing.[33] A continuous application of machine techniques to formerly wholly hand processes exerted unique pressures on manufacturing.[34] In addition, existing machines were refined and made more automatic.[35] The maintenance of this increase in production also depended upon the creation of a new organizational form within industry. The factory system, as a mode of integrating the machine into the production process, rationalized industry with the interjection of three technigues: division of labour, sub-division of process and specialization of output.[36] Enlargement in both the scale and total productive output of manufacturing, when combined with an accumulating complexity within the production process itself, convinced many Ontarioans that more skilled manpower was required to sustain existing levels of economic growth. The Royal Commission on the Relations between Capital and Labour, in support of its recommendation that technical schools be built and the school curriculum be made more "practical", pointed out how the "great increase in the use of delicate and intricate machinery in manufacturing demands a more thorough indust-

---

[32]J. G. Hodgins, "Special Report to the Minister of Education on the Ontario Exhibit at the International Exhibition", *Appendix to the Report of the Minister of Education of Ontario*, 1876, p. 247.

[33]See O. J. Firestone, *Industry and Education* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1969), p. 129 and Peter Goheen, *Victorian Toronto* (Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Geography, Research Paper No. 127, 1970).

[34]See William Kilbourn, *The Elements Combined* (Toronto: Copp-Clark, 1965) and J.J. Brown, *Ideas in Exile* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1969).

[35]See "New Machinery", *The Canadian Engineer*, July 1, 1898.

[36]See Canada, Commission Appointed to Enquire into the Working of Mills and Factories of the Dominion and Labour Employed Therein, *Report*, 1882.

rial and technical training on the part of those who are to use the machines."[37] Any improvement in the "mechanical skill of the industrial classes", declared the Commissioners, "must add largely to the wealth and prosperity of the nation."[38]

The growing awareness of the economic relationships between schooling and material production was reflected in the pattern of public investment in education. Between the years 1867 - 1896, the population of Canada increased at an annual average rate of 1.4%, while the Gross National Product rose by 33%. During the same period, per capita expenditures on formal education climbed from $1.00 to $2.50,[39] In addition, the ratio of educational expenditures to total GNP rose from less than 1% in 1867 to about 1¼% in 1896.[40] One implication of this investment pattern was an apparent shift in perception by policy makers regarding the economic function of education. Educational expenditures came to be seen less as an item of personal consumption and more as a public investment in human capital. Manual training, in particular, offered a direct means of improving the skills of industrial labor, and one which promised to yield immediate returns in the form of heightened worker efficiency and increased total production. "It can now be taken for granted," announced Chancellor Nathaniel Burwash of Victoria University, that "education contributes to the production of a nation's material wealth and to a nation's well-being in every direction."[41]

Economic growth and industrial efficiency were not the sole justifications of demands for the introduction of manual training. True, advocates of manual training, like urban boards of trade, stressed the interdependence between national prosperity and the ability of society, through its schools, to train and deliver a skilled labor force. At the same time, however, they dreaded the social consequences of an education which mirrored the separation of work and morality so characteristic of industrial societies. Supporters of manual training resolved this dilemma by adopting the characteristic strategy of most late nineteenth century social reform; they built moral education into manual training.

A vocal champion for the moral value of manual training was James L. Hughes, Inspector of schools for the Toronto Board of Education and one of Ontario's main propagandists for the "new education." Manual training, to Hughes, rested on certain axioms: that "manual dexterity may be cultivated; that it is easier to train the hand of a child than of an

[37]Canada, Royal Commission on the Relations of Capital and Labour, *Report*, 1889, p. 121.

[38]*Ibid.*, p. 122.

[39]O. J. Firestone, *Industry and Education* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1969), p. 183.

[40]*Ibid.*, p. 183.

[41]Nathaniel Burwash, "The Economics of Education", Ontario Education Association, *Proceedings and Addresses*, 1895, p. 155.

older person; and, therefore, the sooner the industrial training of a child begins, the more perfect will be his development."[42] Hughes, unlike some of his American counterparts, did not perceive industrial education as a route leading to the upward mobility of the working classes. At best, he believed that "practical education" could ease a working class child's necessary move from the family to industrial labor and thereby prevent the needless public expense of caring for those unable on their own to negotiate the transition. "The majority of our pupils," declared Hughes, will have to earn for themselves and their families not only the means of livelihood, but of culture available for them by the use of their hands."[43] Manual training, moreover, would elevate the working classes by improving their productive skills and increasing the value of the product. Here, Hughes raised an assumption under-lying manual training on which labour and capital strongly disagreed: that the investment of time and money in manual training by increasing the capacity of a worker to improve the quality or increase the quantity of goods produced, would be returned to him in the form of higher wages.[44]

Hidden in the rhetoric of economic development, worker efficiency and individual uplift which permeated the manual training idea, nestled a confident hope that such education would condition the labouring classes into a grateful acceptance of their lot in society. "Improving a workman's position," mused Hughes, "will make him more contented and happy,"[45] The path to such contentment, and its social benefits, was through love of work:

> He will be more interested in his work and more proud to occupy his sphere of labour in proportion that he is able to excel in it. It will better the relationship between master and workman. Success will induce him to make greater efforts, and will enable him to surround himself and his family with many of the elements of culture and refinement. This manual training also has an important moral influence in moulding the characters of children. They are naturally destructive but the same tendency which leads them to destroy will make them delight in work of a productive character. Thousands of children grow up with a contempt for work. They generally become a burden on society. Labour, all labour, is noble and holy. The only way to make this beautiful thought a practical verity is to train children to be able to work with their hands.[46]

Hughes' espousal of the moral content and social control function of manual training paralleled the position expressed by advocates of the industrial school. In at least two areas, however, the manual training concept diverged from that of the industrial school. Proponents of manual training, from its inception in Ontario, envisaged it as a regular part of the public

---

[42]James L. Hughes, "Industrial Education", Ontario Education Association *Proceedings and Addresses*, 1884, p. 48.

[43]*Ibid.*, p. 49.

[44]See Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, *Report of Proceedings*, 1887, pp. 25 - 26.

[45]Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

[46]*Ibid.*, p. 50.

school curriculum and not to be operated voluntarily in a separate, semi-private institution. The explanation of this difference rests in the fact that industrial school and manual training occupied different positions and served relatively distinct purposes within the reform process. Industrial schools operated mainly as a curative or therapeutic institution repairing presumed defects in the moral character of pauper and delinquent children. Manual training, on the other hand, offered society an early preventative device through which to systematically build into a child's character those conventional values, personal ideals and behavioral patterns which would constrain potential deviations from acceptable conduct. A totally effective manual training program, it followed, would eradicate the need for industrial schools.

Most exponents of a manual training emphasis for industrial education believed that their social and educational objectives could be attained by an addition of new courses to the existing public school curriculum. A minority of practising industrial educators, however, talked of "shopwork" as an alternate concept. The leading propagandist of the shopwork idea was William Houston, Principal of Woodstock College, a spokesman for university extension and an activist in the prison reform movement. Houston and other shopwork educators brought to industrial education techniques and theories of behavior control similar to those developed in the emerging administrative science of school management.[47] A central tenet in the creed of this new breed of educational managers was an awareness that the organizational structure of institutions could be manipulated so as to encourage certain patterns of conduct and values in its members. In the school context, such prominent personages as John Millar, Deputy Minister of Education, urged teachers and principals to order the rules and regulations of schools in ways that would foster habits of regularity, punctuality, industry, neatness, obedience, self control and love of work."[48] The whole atmosphere of a well-conducted school," wrote Millar, "is one of activity, the law of work is felt everywhere." Millar's concept of the school as a model of industrial society, moreover, bore remarkable similarity to the views articulated by supporters of the industrial school:

> The machinery of a well-managed school is the most powerful instrument for forming good habits in a pupil and for strengthening his will, so that he may overcome the evils to be met in the battles of life. Some of the sterner virtues which are much needed in this age are especially fostered by a well-organized school. Such an institution draws pupils from all classes and conditions and gives them a fore-taste of those social and industrial relations for which they are to be prepared. The school's an epitome of society. Justice, forebearance, courtesy and obedience to authority are drawn in as breath of school life when a good state of discipline is established. It is not formal lessons in the duties of citizenship that is needed in school so much as that discipline which fashions the young into self-directing beings, which trains them to industrious habits and which promotes those other virtues that render them useful

[47]See: John Millar, *The Educational System of the Province of Ontario* (Toronto: Warwick, 1893), p. 5.

[48]John Millar, *School Management* (Toronto: Warwick, 1895) p. 20.

members of society.[49]

The school shop, as developed by Houston at Woodstock College, epitomized the society of the factory. "The primary object of the public school", Houston maintained, was to prepare a child for practical living, and the best way to teach how to live is to deal with the identical things that will surround the student in his later life."[50] As did James L. Hughes, Houston readily adopted the view that most children would spend their working lives in some aspect of factory production. No better service could be rendered these children, it followed, than to simulate factory conditions within schools through a shop laboratory. A shop environment, Houston stressed, not only introduced students to the skills of a particular trade, but also to the organizing principles and values governing factory life. Accordingly, students in the shop assumed the responsibilities entailed in specific factory roles: tradesman, foreman, labourer. Noticeably absent in this regard, were roles related to labour unions. With such a replica of the factory in the school, Houston confidently predicted that "no boy can, for four years undergo a course of manual training in a shop and fail to learn to regard manual labor as most honorable."[51]

The shopwork concept found its most thorough application in a series of federally supervised industrial schools for Indian children. Even more than the shops built for white children, industrial schools for Indians placed moral training and social control at the core of their programmes. The residential nature of Indian industrial schools, since it prevented the exercise of parental influence in the content and process of their children's education, functioned as a deliberate mechanism of cultural assimilation. As early as 1847, Egerton Ryerson, in a Special Report on Indian Industrial Schools, isolated social control and cultural assimilation as the twin purposes of such schools:

> As to the objects of these establishments, I understand them not to contemplate anything more in respect to intellectual training then to give a plain English education adopted to the working farmer and mechanic . . . Hence the necessity of providing for their domestic education, and for every part of their religious instruction. This last, I conceive to be absolutely essential, not merely upon general Christian principles, but also upon the ground of what I may term Indian economics, as it is a fact established by numerous experiments, that the North American Indian cannot be civilized or preserved in a state of civilization (including habits of industry and sobriety) except in connection with, if not by the influence of, not only religious instruction and sentiment but of religious feelings . . . Even a knowledge of the doctrines and moral precepts of orthodox Christianity, with all the appliances of prudential example and instruction, is inadequate to produce, in the heart and life of the Indian, the spirit and habits of an industrial civilization without the additional energy and impulsive activity of religious feeling. The animating and controlling spirit of each industrial school should . . . therefore, in my opinion be a religious one.[52]

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[50] William Houston, "Manual Training", Ontario Education Association, *Addresses and Proceedings,* 1890, p. 75.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[52] Egerton Ryerson, *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians*, 1847, p. 1.

A growing dissatisfaction with the "civilizing performance" of Indian schools run by religious denominations moved the Department of Indian Affairs, in the late nineteenth century, to construct a series of residential industrial schools.[53] Five such schools were located in Ontario; the most prominent of which was at Brantford. Each school contained a number of shop laboratories providing training in the rudiments of carpentry, building construction, printing, painting, mechanics and boot and shoe making. In a desire to approximate industrial conditions, instructors strictly enforced factory work routines and time schedules.

Industrial schools in the late nineteenth century were integral components of a concerted effort by the Indian Affairs Department to eliminate what became known as the "Indian problem." Similar in rhetoric to popular views of the "child problem", the "Indian problem" was described as the outcome of three contributing factors: the Indian's ignorance of the English language, his lack of industrial training and his segregation from the dominant society. Indian Affairs officials, and particularly their school instructors, increasingly presented the view that each dimension of the "Indian problem" could be lessened, if not removed entirely, through controlled and extensive use of industrial schools.[54] A residential industrial school, since instruction was wholly in English, furnished maximal conditions within which the Indian child could acquire that language. As an additional incentive, many instructors established facility in English as a prerequisite to advanced industrial training in the schools. This immersion strategy, developed first in language teaching, also formed the basis of the approach to industrial training itself. "To make a blacksmith or a carpenter", observed *The Guide*, "the blacksmith shop and the carpenter shop with a competent head and surrounded by competent workmen, is the true place."[55] As in industrial schools for white children and manual training programs, the anticipated outcome of the shopwork experience was a new value orientation for the child:

> He acquires another most essential quality seldom or never taken into consideration in estimating his needs, and that is the courage of civilization, the courage of language, the courage of industry. The courage and ability for the higher competition are only to be acquired by actual experiences in that competition. There is therefore, all the greater need that every part of the education of the Indian should be carried forward under the association and competition indicated.[56]

"The best way to get civilization unto the Indian, ergo, the best way to get industry and industrial skill into the Indian," concluded *The Guide*, "is to get the Indian into industry and industrial skill."

---

[53]See W. J. Wasylow, "History of Battleford Industrial School for Indians" (Saskatoon: unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1912); Morris Zaslow, *The Opening of the Canadian North* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971) p. 20; and Nicholas F. Davin, *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds,* Ottawa 14, 1879.

[54]See Department of Indian Affairs, *Annual Reports*, 1885 - 1900.

[55]"Industrial Training as Applied to Indian Schools," *The Guide* June, 1896, p. 2.

[56]*Ibid.*, p. 3.

Shopwork was not the dominant mode of industrial education in the late nineteenth century. The concept, and its application at Woodstock College and Indian industrial schools, however, sensitized educators and reformers to ways in which the structure of school environments could be manipulated and used to reinforce the social purposes of instructional programs. Due in part to the awareness of this linkage between institutional structures, values, and conduct, the shopwork model gained steadily in popularity among twentieth century technical-vocational educators.

Voluntary associations in late nineteenth century Ontario often provided the initiative and testing ground for much of what eventually emerged as government social policy. This pattern was evident in the field of industrial education. City missionaries and YM-YWCA workers, in their attempts to apply the ethical principles of Christianity to social problems, introduced kitchen gardens and manual training rooms as countervailing attractions to the saloon and other enticements of street life.[57] Woman's associations, like the National Council of Women and local Woman's Institutes, on their part, urged the Provincial Government to develop domestic science within public schools as a means of preserving family cohesiveness, improving child-rearing practices and instructing girls in the practical art of home-making.[58] A built-in feature of the kindergarten — in many ways the most heralded of all reformative environments — also involved children in practical experimentation with objects drawn from real life.[59]

Of the voluntary initiatives in industrial education, however, none projected a more forceful image than that of Sir William Macdonald, a Montreal tobacco millionaire. The beneficial effects of agricultural education on productive efficiency in the dairy industry had greatly impressed Macdonald. By analogy he reasoned that manual training might do the same for manufacturing. In collaboration with James W. Robertson, Dominion Commissioner of Dairying and the man selected by Macdonald to administer his interests in manual training, Macdonald provided funds for the establishment of manual training schools in various parts of the Dominion. At the close of a three year experimental period, Macdonald offered the manual training schools to local educational authorities on the condition that they would integrate them with the public school system.

James W. Robertson, the individual selected by Macdonald to administer his manual training scheme, conceived of industrial education as the embodiment of a naturalistic philosophy of education. A school, argued Robertson, should provide an educational environment in harmony with the

[57]See S. Matheson, "The Church and Social Problems", *Canadian Methodist Magazine*, January, 1894; M. Fish, "City Mission Work as it Effects the Problem of the Poor", *Canadian Methodist Magazine*, June, 1897, and "Social Settlements", *The Globe*, July 14, 1897.

[58]See Mrs. James L. Hughes, "The Place of a Mother in Education and Training of the Children", National Council of Women of Canada, *Proceedings*, 1895.

[59]See J. L. Hughes, "The Influence of the Kindergarten Spirit in Higher Education", Ontario Education Association, *Proceedings and Addresses*, 1896.

"natural capacities and abilities of pupils."[60] Too often, "bookish or scholastic education prevented the child from selecting a natural mode of expression and, instead, forced him to express himself through writing." The solution to this problem was clear: "Scholarship and manual instruction must join hands in the schools to train the whole child, and not merely the memory and language faculties." Robertson distinguished his concept of manual training from both trade training and shop-work. Unlike narrow trade training, he stressed, manual training offered an "educational means for developing intellectual and moral qualities in all children." Nor was manual training the classroom equivalent of the factory workshop. "A workshop is a money-making institution," observed Robertson, "whereas a room for manual training is for the training and developing of children without regard to the extrinsic value of the work turned out or the length of time required to make any particular object."

The Macdonald Manual Training Fund found a willing ally in Richard Harcourt, Ontario's Minister of Education. As many before him, Harcourt stressed the symbiotic relationship between schooling and industry. "The progress of science, in this latter part of the nineteenth century has revolutionized all our industries," he observed in the introduction to his first report as Minister of Education, "and it is safe to predict that in the approaching century many changes may be expected regarding the relative values of different branches of study."[61] The immediate need, to Harcourt, was a more "practical" bent in the curriculum of elementary and high schools. In particular, this meant that "the subjects taken up . . . should have in view the pursuits that will necessarily be followed by the great majority of our citizens". These future citizens, above all, "should be trained to do, to create, and to produce.[62]

The blend of Robertson's persuasive campaign, Macdonald's philanthropy and Harcourt's political influence was potent enough to convince a number of Ontario school boards to establish manual training centers. The first center opened in Brockville in April, 1900. Shortly thereafter, centers appeared in Ottawa and Toronto. Unlike Hodgins' campaign in the 1870's, the Macdonald movement succeeded in persuading many Ontarioans that schools could best serve students and society by gearing their programmes to the labor requirements of industry. The establishment of a series of demonstration schools in Ontario, moreover, provided such pressure groups as the Canadian Manufacturers Association and urban boards of trade with case examples of the workability of school-based manual training.

---

[60]J. W. Robertson, "The Macdonald Manual Training Schools", *Canadian Magazine and National Review*, July, 1901.

[61]Ontario Department of Education, *Annual Report of the Minister of Education*, 1899, p. xxii.

[62]*Ibid.*, p. xxii.

III

Manual training was an abrasion in the already tense relationships between capital and labour.[63] The friction resulted, in part, from conflicting interpretations of the implications of the term "manual training." Organized labour conceived of manual training within public schools as a form of job training. The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada raised three objections to this type of education: credentials required for entrance into a trade would be obtainable from sources outside of union control, an already over-crowded labour market would be glutted further by public school tradesmen and manual training would trap children of the working classes by denying them the type of education which would increase their chances for upward social mobility.[64] "Manual training would be prejudicial to the interest and welfare of mechanics generally," Robert Glocking announced to the 1888 Trades and Labour Congress Convention, for it "would thus be able to take any situation rendered vacant through strikes or other causes, to the detriment of mechanics who had served a regular apprenticeship."[65] Glocking's suspicion that industrial education might be used as a device for strike-breaking was well-founded, for business interests in the period, led by urban boards of trade, urged the Provincial and Federal Governments to adopt manual training as one means of lessening the occurrence of "industrial strife and recurrent strikes."[66]

As a counter-proposal to public school manual training, labour interests recommended the extension of technical education. A technical education, founded on the theoretical principles underpinning a trade, they argued, equipped the worker with a broader education and one which offered the knowledge required to adjust to the automation of his particular calling. Apprenticeship and public school manual training were incapable of producing such a flexible worker, for each method locked him into the routinized performance of specific tasks in the production process. A technical education, however, provided the individual with those intellectual abilities and skills necessary for occupational advancement.[67] Labour organizations, during the period, lobbied against manual training at the federal, provincial and municipal levels. At the same time, they fought for the extension of technical education. A step toward this goal was taken in 1891 with the founding of Toronto Technical School. Funds for

[63]See Martin Robin, *Radical Politics and Canadian Labour* (Kingston: Industrial Relations Center, Queen's University, 1970).

[64]Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, *Report of Proceedings*, 1887, pp. 25-26. The TLCC passed a resolution each year from 1887 - 1890 opposing the introduction of manual training into the public schools.

[65]TLCC. *Proceedings*, 1888, p. 25.

[66]*Ibid.*, p. 25.

[67]See "Technical Education", *The Globe*, December 30, 1899, and "Technical Education", *Labour Day Souvenir*, 1899, p. 12.

the new school came from a special grant of city council. Certain features of the new school reflected labour's insistence that concepts of manual training not form the basis of technical education. Unlike the stress on manual dexterity in school shops, the curriculum of the new school included courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, minerology, steam engines and practical electricity. A joint labour-business board appointed by city council, moreover, assumed responsibility for the administration of the school. This initial separation of Toronto Technical School from direct Provincial Government and local school board involvement, it seems, was the price paid for a practical education founded upon principles other than those associated with manual training or shopwork.

Business interests in Ontario couched their criticisms of the absence of a state system of manual training or technical education in terms of a national emergency in need of immediate action. Businessmen hotly denounced the labour lobby against manual training as an impediment to the progress of both labour and capital. Commenting on labour's "pressure tactics" in school board meetings, the *Canadian Manufacturer and Industrial World* warned that:

> Such action was not in the interest of Canada or of anyone living in Canada, including those who favour it. The day is coming when trouble will result from this effort of the Labour organizations to perpetuate ignorance and prevent the youths of the country from acquiring a technical education that will fit and prepare them to take their proper positions in society. Do these men love their children?[68]

In the late nineteenth century, urban boards of trade were most vocal in expressing the business interest in manual training and technical education. The most active of these boards were located in the cities of Ottawa and Toronto. In 1898, the Ottawa board launched a campaign to obtain a technical school for the capital city. Such a school, "by furthering the manufacturing interests", proclaimed the Ottawa board, would "inevitably advance the interests of the whole community."[69] Despite the active support of many people in Ottawa, the board failed to convince George Ross, Minister of Education, to provide financial aid for the proposed school. Rebuked at the Provincial level, the Ottawa board turned its efforts toward obtaining federal support for a general program of technical education.

The Toronto board enlarged the Ottawa position and urged the Provincial government to introduce both technical education and manual training as integral features of the public school curriculum. The major spokesman for this view was M.S.D. Allan, Chairman of the Technical Education Committee of the Toronto board and Vice-President of AAA fur manufacturers. Education, to Allan, encompassed two purposes: culture and capability. The route to culture was through traditional academic disciplines.

---

[68]"Industrial Education", *Canadian Manufacturer and Industrial World*, May, 1898, p. 2.

[69]Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education* (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1914). Vol. IV, p. 2105.

Capability, however, developed and increased in proportion to the augmentation of a person's productive efficiency. Both culture and capability, argued Allan, could be nurtured through a broad industrial education which blended discipline of the mind, training of the hand and moulding of the moral character. Public investment in such an education, particularly for the working classes, would amply repay expenditure by a resultant increase "in commercial and industrial efficiency, a higher level of civic duty, a wider diffusion of moral culture and religious feeling."[70] As did the Ottawa board, the Toronto Board of Trade failed to convince George Ross of the validity of their case. This rebuff at the provincial level would not be overcome until well into the new century.

IV

By the close of the century, educators had established the basic concepts which would guide the further development of manual training and vocational education. It was not until the passage of the 1911 Industrial Education Act, however, that the Provincial Government formally committed itself to industrial education as part of public schooling. The new Act, based on John Seath's report in the same year "Education for Industrial Purposes", used institutional specialization as a means of integrating the various streams in the industrial education movement. Seath, echoing the themes of economic efficiency, labor regulation and social control, argued that industrial education would overcome several obstacles to "educational modernization": the decline of apprenticeship and absence of alternate procedures for the recruitment of skilled manpower; the inability of teachers, parents or truant officers to halt the potentially dangerous rise in the number of unskilled, early school leavers; and the rigid departmental examinations which encouraged an overly academic bias in school programs.[71] Under the Act, three new types of school were established: the General Industrial School, Special Industrial School and Technical High School. Each school was to serve a specific clientele and feed into the labor market at specific points. General industrial schools, for students beyond the leaving age of fourteen, offered a "general industrial intelligence" and a waiting room until the labor market opened sufficiently to absorb the students. Special industrial schools, on the other hand, provided specific trade training for the needs of local industries. At the high point in the new industrial education hierarchy was the technical high school, or technical department within a secondary school. These schools, as Seath conceived of them, would serve those "who would prepare for positions in industrial life which require special technical knowledge and are of greater importance and responsibility than those held by skilled mechanics."[72] In an attempt to placate labour's suspicions of a government-business collusion, the Act recommended the formation of local advisory

[70]Toronto Board of Trade, *Report of the Committee on Technical Education* (Toronto: Hunter-Rose, 1899.) p. 2.

[71]John Seath, *Education for Industrial Purposes* (Toronto: King's Printer, 1911).

[72]*Ibid.*, p. 289.

industrial education committees to control the new schools. Along the same lines, the Act clarified the meaning and intent of various contentious terms used in the context of industrial education: "industrial" applied to schools and classes for the training of workmen; "technical" to schools and classes for the preparation of foremen and low level supervisory roles in trades and "manual training" to "cultural" and practical subjects in the regular curriculum.

The 1911 Industrial Education Act reflected a shift in emphasis in industrial education from moral character building to the regulation of labor. In the late nineteenth century, the sheer pressure of numbers on schools, in conjunction with a rapid increase in urban social problems, led educators to stress the social control aspects of schooling, and industrial education was no exception. By 1911, however, educators had worked out a rational and efficient system of school management and behavioral control.[73] The next step was to link that school system as closely as possible to the manpower demands of the economy. Establishing industrial education as a tracking system to the occupational structure was part of this process. The state, through the 1911 Act, engaged in one of the first formal attempts to assign occupational roles through the direct manipulation of the school system. This was clearly evident in the 1911 Act's provision for separate types of industrial schools and programmes leading to clearly identified slots in the occupational structure. Educational programs and oppportunities, from this point on, were to be adjusted to the needs of industry. Education, indeed, was "for industrial purposes."

Modern day advocates of vocational education, in common with most historians of the earlier industrial education and manual training movements, discuss these programs as indicators of the emergence of a preferred meritocratic educational system: that is, one which assigns individuals to places solely on the basis of merit or ability. The school system which introduces and further refines such programs, particularly those that strike the closest relationship to industry, receives plaudits as forward-looking and "progressive."[74] Current vocational programmes and schools, however, do not contribute to either equality of opportunity or a more meritocratic educational system. In fact, as the present study indicates, such programs or schools were never designed with those puposes in mind. Moreover, in Toronto, a recent study of the relationship between the occupational level of the head of the household and the probability of the child being placed in a vocational or special education track revealed the following pattern:

> If, for example, you're classified as a "sheet metal worker, a mechanic or a repairman," the *Every Student Survey* tells us, your child has 18.5 times the chance of ending up

[73]See John Millar, *The School System of Ontario* (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1896).

[74]See for Example: A. G. Stapleton, "Does Vocational Education Meet the Hiring Criteria of Employers?" *Canadian Vocational Journal* Vol. 7 Sept. 1971. pp. 6 - 10 and W. L. Ziverman, "Changing Social Relations of Industry and Education", *Canadian Vocational Journal* Vol. 8 Summer, 1972, pp. 12 - 19.

> in one of these bottom streams as the child of an "accountant, an engineer or a lawyer." If you're a "labourer, a truck driver or taxi driver," your child has 20.5 times the chance of being in one of the "special classes" as the child from one of these top professional families. If you're "retired, on pension, or workmen's compensation," the figure goes up to 40 times the chance. If you're unemployed, the figure rises again to 43.5, and if you're classified as on "welfare or mother's allowance," the figure moves up to an incredible 67.[75]

Focusing on only schools within an inner city area, with relatively low socioeconomic characteristics, the same study produced an even more accentuated version of this pattern.

> If your child goes to one of these eight schools, and you're a "sheet metal worker, a mechanic or a repairman", then we estimate that your child has approximately 24 times the chance that he'll be in the lowest stream than the child of the "accountant, the engineer, or the lawyer". (We're assuming the city average holds here; in fact, there are no lawyers', accountants' or engineers' children in any of these classes in any of the eight schools.) If you're a "labourer, a truck driver, or a taxi driver" your child has 34.9 times the chance of being in one of these lowest classes as the child of any one of these three top professionals. If you're "retired, on pension or workmen's compensation" the figure goes up to 68 times the chance. If you're "unemployed" the figure rises again to 74. And if you're classified as on "welfare or mother's allowance" the figure moves up to an even more incredible figure of 107. Finally, no matter what social and economic level you're from, if your child simply attends one of these eight schools, he or she has 2.1 times the chance of being put into the bottom stream than the average child from across the city.[76]

Deliberations and arguments in the past concerning the structure, purposes and content of industrial education never focused on the entire range of available students, but on a specific identifiable group; the children of the poor, native, immigrant or criminal. To a large extent, it is still the function of vocational education to label and certify the children of the poor, immigrant, criminal and Indian for slots on the lowest rung of the occupational ladder. The findings of such investigations as the *Every Student Survey*, when placed in the perspective of historical analyses of the motives and social purposes associated with industrial education, lead inescapably to the conclusion that such programs have consistently contributed to the maintenance of social class and racial divisions and the prevention of any significant mobility between rich and poor in Canadian society. "The end result", as isolated so clearly by the Park School Community Council, "is the same as it always has been — to help keep poor kids, working class kids, at the bottom of the society, where their parents have been."[77]

---

[75]"Class Bias in Toronto Schools", *This Magazine is about Schools,* Vol. 5, No. 4, 1971, p. 12.

[76]*Ibid.*, p. 12.

[77]*Ibid.*, p. 12. The more general relationship between poverty and educational attainment is documented more fully elsewhere. See, for example, *Poverty in Canada*, A Report of the Special Committee of Senate, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1971), pp 111 - 121; John Harp and John Hofley eds., *Poverty in Canada* (Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1970), passim; Thomas Ryan, *Poverty and The Child: A Canadian Study* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1972.)