

Principles of Bilingual Education in the 1920s:
The Imperial Education Conferences and French-English Schooling in Alberta

by

Anne-Marie Lizaire-Szostak

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Administration and Leadership

Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta

Abstract

French Immersion and Francophone education in Alberta are both examples of publicly funded French-English bilingual education since the 1970s and 1980s. To better understand French Immersion in Alberta today, as well as the basis of calls to recognize it as rights-based education, it is important to understand how bilingual education evolved during the early years in this province. In this historical research dissertation, bilingual education and policy formation in Alberta are examined in the context of the burgeoning provincial society, within a British dominion, at a time when English liberalism was beginning to recognize national minorities and the Empire was transforming into the Commonwealth. This case study is based on document analysis of reports from the Imperial Education Conferences, especially that of 1923, which promoted bilingual education. The conceptual framework is informed by principles of interpretive historical sociology, drawing upon Kymlicka's (1995/2000) liberal theoretical argument of national minority rights based on equality.

Bilingual education was presented as a parental right at the Imperial Education Conferences in 1911, 1923, and 1927. Through these conferences, new perspectives concerning bilingualism were diffused throughout the Commonwealth and managed, with assistance, to take root in Alberta. Given the notable experience of Wales and South Africa with bilingual education, and the slow but steady reconstruction of bilingual education in Alberta, Kymlicka's arguments for group differentiated rights within a liberal polity further clarifies the claim for French Immersion to be recognized as a type of rights-based education in Alberta.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Chapter 1: The Research Problem.....	1
Context.....	2
Research Purpose and Theoretical Underpinnings	4
Research Problem and Questions.....	6
The Researcher.....	9
Significance of the Research.....	10
Delimitations.....	11
Limitations	12
Definitions.....	14
Organization of the Thesis	15
Chapter 2: The Literature Review	16
Bilingualism and Intelligence	18
Before the 1920s	19
The 1920s to 1950s, Including the Welsh Studies.....	21
New Findings Based on Student Contexts.....	24
Bilingualism Evaluated Without Psychometric Testing	25
Summary of the First Section	26
Bilingualism and Pedagogy	26
Factors of Bilingualism.....	27

Research Trends in Bilingual Education/FI.....	30
Bilingual Education/FI, Home Language, and SES.....	31
Summary of the Second Section	33
Socio-political and Historical Research in Bilingual Education/FI.....	33
French-English Bilingual Education.....	33
Summary of the Third Section	37
Theoretical Framework.....	38
Liberalism and Language Use	38
Citizenship: Language, Education, and Rights	42
Summary of the Fourth Section	48
Conclusion	48
Chapter 3: The Methodology	51
Qualitative Historical Sociological Case Study.....	51
Definition of a Case Study.....	51
Definition of Historical Sociology.....	55
Definition of Interpretive Historical Sociology (IHS).....	57
The Critiques of an IHS Single Case Study.....	59
The Rationale for an Interpretive Historical Sociology Single Case Study.....	60
Quality Criteria for my Research.....	61
Trustworthiness Criteria.....	62
Authenticity Criteria	63
Method	64

Document Analysis	64
Primary and Secondary Sources	65
Archives	67
Location of Source	68
Identification of Material.	70
Document Appraisal and Analysis.....	75
The Rationale for Multicultural Citizenship as Theoretical Framework	78
Time Frame, Periods, and Contexts to be Studied.....	79
Purpose of Chosen Methodology, Method, and Theoretical Framework	80
Conclusion	81
 Chapter 4: The Educational and Political Context in the Northwest	
Territories/Alberta at the Turn of the 20th Century	82
Bilingualism in Government and Schools of the Northwest Territories, 1800s-1905.....	83
Freeman’s Nation-building Political Theory and its Popularity in Canada.....	92
Laurie’s Nation-building Pedagogy and its Influence in Alberta	93
Assimilation Through Public Education in Alberta After 1905	100
Conclusion	103
 Chapter 5: Little Known British Conferences of Great Importance	
The Politics of the Imperial Conferences.....	106
The ICs, Imperialism, and the Commonwealth	106
The ICs, Autonomy, and the Commonwealth	107
The ICs, the Bond Among English-speaking Nations and the League of Nations.....	111

The Nature of the Imperial Education Conferences	113
An overview of the FCE and the IECs.....	113
Opportunities to Shape Political Agendas and Policy	116
The Value of Non-Binding Conference Recommendations	120
Conclusion	124
Chapter 6: The IECs, the ICs and the Local Press.....	125
General Characteristics of the ICs' Coverage in the Local Press	125
The Local Newspapers (1907-1927).....	127
The English Language Newspapers.....	127
The French Language Newspapers	128
The Coverage in the Local Newspapers in 1907 and 1911	131
The FCE (1907) in the Local Press.....	132
The IEC (1911) in the Local Press.....	133
The Coverage in Local Newspapers in 1923 and 1927	136
The IEC (1923) in the Local Press.....	137
The IEC (1927) in the Local Press.....	144
Conclusion	149
Chapter 7: Silent Government Reports and Absent Agents-General.....	150
The FCE/IECs in Provincial Government Reports.....	150
The FCE/IECs and Alberta's Three Agents-General.....	152
Conclusion	158

Chapter 8: The FCE (1907) and the IEC (1911)	159
The Federal Conference on Education (1907)	159
London-Alberta Connection Strengthened via Textbooks and Education	159
Bilingual Education Discussed at the FCE (1907)	163
The Coverage of the FCE (1907) in <i>The Times</i>	165
The Imperial Education Conference (1911)	167
Absence of Local Representation at the Bilingual Education Session	168
Distribution of the Report of the IEC (1911).....	168
Different Views of Bilingual Education at the EIC (1911)	169
A Source of Early and Longstanding Rhetoric Against Bilingualism	172
The Coverage of the IEC (1911) in <i>The Times</i>	176
Conclusion	180
Chapter 9: The IEC (1923) and the IEC (1927)	182
The Imperial Education Conference (1923)	182
The Session Entitled “The Bilingual Problem . . .”	183
The Recommendations.....	196
The Coverage of the IEC (1923) in <i>The Times</i>	198
The Presence of the IEC (1923) in <i>The Times’ Educational Supplement</i>	203
Summary of the Imperial Education Conference of 1923	204
The Imperial Education Conference (1927)	205
Obstacles to Teacher Interchanges.....	206
The Role of the Vernacular in Education	208

The Use of New Technologies in Education	210
The Coverage of the IEC (1927) in the <i>The Times</i>	212
Summary of the Imperial Education Conference (1927).....	218
Conclusion	219
Chapter 10: Bilingual Education in Alberta, 1920-1930	221
Bilingual Education After World War I.....	221
England's new Practical Education	223
More Local Promotion of England's new Ideals in Education.....	228
Post-war Language Education Opportunities for Teachers in Alberta	230
A Balance Between the IEC Consensus and the Provincial Anglo-dominant Norm	233
The New Departmental Guidelines for French-English Bilingual Education	236
Bilingual Education in Alberta Following the IEC Recommendations of 1923	240
The Reaction of the French-speaking Community in Alberta	249
Conclusion	253
Chapter 11: Dean Kerr and the University of Alberta French Club and Debate	
Society Culture	254
Faculty of the University of Alberta and the Promotion of the French Language	256
Bilingualism via the French Club, the French Play, and the Debate Society	258
Unity, Bilingualism and the French Club	260
Unity, Bilingualism and French Canadian Literature	262
Bilingualism and the Debate Culture at the University of Alberta	264

Unity and Bilingualism Fostered Through Larger Student Organizations	266
Conclusion	272
Chapter 12: The 1920s and Liberalism.....	274
Liberalism Broadly Defined	274
Liberalism and Public Education in Canada in the Early 20 th Century	275
Social Unity, Citizenship Education and Public Schools in a Liberal State	276
National Minorities, Official Languages and Shared Membership in a Liberal State....	279
Arguments in Favor of National Minority Rights in a Liberal State.....	286
National Minority Rights in a Liberal State Based on the Equality Argument	287
The Historical Argument for National Rights in a Liberal State	293
The Diversity Argument and National Minorities in a Liberal State.....	298
The Problem and the Potential with the use of the Majority's Self-interest to Promote Diversity within the Liberal State	299
Conclusion	301
Chapter 13: Project Considerations, Implications and Recommendations	303
Considerations.....	303
Implications.....	306
Recommendations.....	316
Conclusion	319
References	321

Abbreviations

A.C.F.A. : Association Canadienne-Francaise de l'Alberta

A.C.F.C.S. or A.C.F.C. : Association Catholique Franco-Catholique de la Saskatchewan

A.C.F.E.O. : Association Canadienne-Française d'Éducation d'Ontario

A.C.E.F.C. : Association des Commissaires d'Écoles Franco-Canadiennes (de la Saskatchewan)

A.E.C.F.M. : Association d'Éducation des Canadiens-Français du Manitoba

A.I.B.A. : Association des Instituteurs Bilingues de l'Alberta

A.E.B.A. : Association des Édicateurs Bilingues de l'Alberta

B.B.C. : British Broadcasting Corporation

C.I.E. : Confédération Internationale des Étudiants

C.R.F.C.C. : Centre for Research on French-Canadian Culture

F.C.J. : Fidèles Compagnes de Jésus / Faithful Companions of Jesus

F.C.E : Federal Conference on Education

F.S.O.L. : French as a second official language education

F. I. : French Immersion

I. C. : Imperial Conference

I. E. C. : Imperial Education Conference

K.K.K. : Klu Klux Klan

L1, L2 : First language, second language

N.F.C.U.S. : National Federation of Canadian University Students

N.U.S. : National Union of Students

N. W. T. : Northwest Territories

O.M.I. : Oblats de Marie-Immaculée / Oblates of Mary-Immaculate

R.I.E.C. : Report of the Imperial Education Conference

S.G.M. : Soeurs Grises de Montréal

T. E.S. : Times Educational Supplement

Chapter 1: The Research Problem

This dissertation is a historical study of the formation of policy related to French immersion education. French immersion (FI) is an approach to language-education promoting a high degree of ability in French and English, while teaching French as a second official language (FSOL) and using it as the language of instruction for much of the school day. In Canada, the aim is for students to become functionally bilingual citizens in both official languages.

FI's formal presence in Alberta since the 1970s has largely been on account of parental demand and it continues to be at the heart of many heated policy discussions. As recently as in 2013, Edmonton Public Schools (EPS) considered dealing with a phenomenal student population increase in one of its dual-track FI/regular program elementary schools by limiting FI enrollments in that school. Following a parental uproar, EPS decided instead to modify the boundaries of the school in question, thereby controlling the school's population by residency rather than by program choice. In 2012, according to *CPF Alberta News*, strong FI parental protests had also influenced the Calgary Board of Education (CBE) to change its proposal that would have seen a transportation fee increase for all the board's FI students, while awarding a transportation fee decrease for all CBE's regular program students. Since the autumn of 2017, however, many FI students in Edmonton and Calgary have had to pay more for school transportation as compared with students in the regular English program (French, *The Edmonton Journal* September 22, 2017, online; Ferguson, *The Calgary Herald*, September 8th, 2017, online). These examples illustrate the precarious state of FI in Alberta where, despite the sustained public popularity of FSOL education, bilingual

schooling is not an assured choice for everyone. As a result, more FI parents are calling for the recognition of FSOL education rights, as CPF and CAIT/ACPI have done since the late 1970s. To understand the roots of these claims and FI's development in Alberta, this project will explore how bilingual education was perceived in the 1920s, through the lens of the Imperial Education Conferences organized in Britain, at the time when the foundation of the framework for FI was established.

Context

There have been many, often contradictory, political agendas, research results, and educational policies that have intersected throughout the history of bilingual education and the FI program in Alberta. At the turn of the 20th century, liberal thought promoted in Great Britain by Edward A. Freeman (1879/1892), but also popular in Ontario, was taking root in western Canada (Aunger, 2001). Liberalism influenced Alberta's politics, and specifically its educational policies (Manzer, 1994).

The linguistic policy in Alberta privileged English, while making no distinctions between French and the many other languages used in the province. This was in contrast to other approaches in bilingual/multilingual regions of the British Empire, such as South Africa in the 1920s. In education, Alberta's position on language has been a justified liberal democratic measure to ensure equal access for residents of Alberta to a good education and the possibility of socio-economic mobility in a society rooted in British conventions. Moreover, this practice allowed the Alberta government to relate to the individual as a member of the provincial polity, independent from other group affiliations. However, through the government's prioritization of English as the common language in public school, and throughout the public sphere, French lost its equal

standing as an official language in this province, and French-speakers lost their ability to participate in their shared society in the language of their choice. As a result, French language education in Alberta has been fraught with challenges for over a century.

Although French first language education in this region goes back to the 19th century, it has been recognized as a right in Alberta only since 1988 in acknowledgement of Canada's commitment to official language communities in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982). However, French language education rights have been restricted to Francophones. Yet, given the mounting pressure for the right to FSOL education across Canada, the limited recognition of French language rights in education is attracting attention. Increasingly, the recognized right to FSOL education in order to promote functional bilingualism, similarly to what was reported to have existed in South Africa at the Imperial Education Conference of 1923, seems to be the expectation at the current time by parents desiring FI for the children in Alberta.

From 1907 to 1927, Great Britain organized a series of conferences in education called the Imperial Education Conferences to discuss matters of interest with representatives of the dominions, colonies and other territories. The idea was to learn from one another in order to strengthen the bonds between the nations of the soon-to-be Commonwealth family. Canada sent a delegation to all these conferences and Dr. Merchant, a leading educationalist from Ontario, was an important participant in many conference discussions and committees. While the meeting in 1907 touched upon the question of teaching English to non-English speakers, the Imperial Education Conference of 1911 was the first to deal with the issue of bilingual education. The 1923 conference ended with the adoption of a resolution composed of six principles of bilingual education.

Although such resolutions did not have the force of law, they certainly indicated the direction of the current thinking and future policymaking of the British Crown and the Commonwealth nations.

The resolutions did not result in bilingual education in Alberta being a guaranteed schooling option. Even today, according to s. 21 of the Alberta School Act (2000), FI is considered an “alternative program”. This means that school boards decide upon access. Anglophone and Allophone Albertans who would choose to be educated in French and English, are vulnerable to changes in their board’s priorities.

Research Purpose and Theoretical Underpinnings

FSOL education rights have increasingly become a defining feature of the discourse among those with a vested interest in FI education; however, FSOL education rights discourse might be a surprising phenomenon to those outside this group. In light of this seemingly new phenomenon, this project is intended to better understand the current condition of FI in Alberta by looking at how French language education in general has developed here. Specifically, the objective of this project is to look at the period of the 1920s, to see how bilingual education was being discussed in Alberta and abroad, and who was involved. The hope is that familiarity with the motivations, the concerns and the issues of such a formative period in bilingual education within the British Empire can lead to a better understanding of FI. Forgotten threads from the 1920s bilingual education discussions may also be found to have run through FI’s development in Alberta. As such, this research provides a socio-historical and political analysis of French language and bilingual education in Alberta.

Francophone education and FI as FSOL education share a history in Alberta: like the two sides of the bilingual coin, they are both separate, yet are always found together. Therefore, to understand the evolution of FI as FSOL education and the basis of the claim for FSOL education rights, it is important to have some appreciation of Francophone education and how Francophone education rights came to be recognized in liberal democratic laws, such as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) and in the Alberta School Act (2000).

Two aspects of Kymlicka's theory of multicultural citizenship (1995/2000) are used as a framework to interpret these events. The first is his perspective justifying group rights in an individual-based society; and the second is his view of nuanced rights between these groups within a heterogeneous state. Kymlicka argues that under certain conditions, group rights can be appropriate within a liberal democracy on account of their promotion of equality of individuals through equitable measures to sustain the group. So long as the group does not infringe on its members' individual freedoms and rights, the recognition of that group's rights may enable the individuals to partake more fully in their liberal democratic society.

The second point is one based on equitable treatment. Kymlicka (1995/2000) views most cultural groups as falling mainly into one of two different categories: ethnic or immigrant groups, and national minorities. The national minorities, deemed minority nations within a larger multination-state, have been incorporated into a foreign entity on account of circumstances rather than by choice. In the process, they have lost their institutions and their socio-political and economic organization. Their language, if not lost entirely, has been severely weakened, as much in terms of number of speakers, as in

terms of power and prestige. For Kymlicka (1995/2000), these nations within a larger state are entitled to certain rights that essentially aim to help redress past wrongs. In order for members of the national minority to be on equal footing with those of the majority, the state has the obligation to ensure equitable conditions for the members of the national minority allowing them to not only survive, but to thrive, just like the individuals of the majority.

Kymlicka's two principles have proven useful in explaining the legitimacy of a national minority group's claim to first language education. How could they also be used to understand the claims of other groups who wish to have a right to the national minority's language as second language education? In light of Kymlicka's rationale, could Section 9 of Alberta's School Act (2000), the right to English language education for all Albertans, be interpreted as a group right to enhance individual participation in Alberta's socio-economic and political activities, regardless of the diversity of that characterizes the group "Albertans"? If so, how could we extend this logic to include both of Canada's official languages? Before even considering these questions, however, it is necessary to have a better appreciation of how bilingualism in education has been portrayed and discussed in the past. Informed by Kymlicka's principles, this project seeks to better understand the interest in bilingual education in the 1920s in the British Empire and how bilingual education was viewed in Alberta at that time.

Research Problem and Questions

French language education rights have been increasingly discussed in more inclusive terms, regardless of whether French is the citizen's first or second official language. As such, this renewed discussion has brought to the forefront the longstanding

FSOL education rights claim by CPF and CAIT/ACPI. In this project, I hope to further my understanding of these positions. As such, familiarity with the history of bilingual education in this province is required: specifically, what occurred here during the 1920s relative to French-English education. Consequently, this project will be concerned with the research and policies in the 1920s concerning bilingualism in education in the British Empire and how these developments were perceived in Alberta at the time. In drawing the attention prior to the formal establishment of FI in the province, to a time in history when bilingualism in education was couched in particular liberal discourses and was the topic of prestigious academic and policy making conferences, the objective will be to inform the understanding of the process that has taken place in Alberta. By becoming acquainted with what happened in Alberta concerning bilingual education during the 1920s, similar ideas may be found to have been involved in the progressive shaping of the state of FI in Alberta. In order to understand any debate about FSOL education rights today in this province, it is prudent to understand how bilingual education was perceived here in the past, how it was discussed, and by whom.

The intent of this project, then, is to make sense of the contextual changes in bilingual education during the 1920s by examining as much as possible the contributions of those involved – researchers, policymakers, school inspectors, teachers and parents. Once this is achieved, readers may draw upon this work for insights in order to make sense of the increasing demand for the recognition of the right to FI as FSOL education in the liberal democratic province of Alberta. Consequently, it is not only important to become familiar with the province's long and rich history of bilingualism and French

language education, but to also be aware of this history couched in a context of evolving liberal political thought and nation-building endeavors.

As such, my research problem concerns the foundations of FI in Alberta. Specifically, my aim is to explore how French-English bilingual education was perceived and practiced in this province in the 1920s and 1930s. Through the lens of Kymlicka's dual principles, I am interested in determining how aspects of the British discourses in bilingual education during the 1920s might have resonated in Alberta, with Albertans. Moreover, I seek to learn how the principles, policies, research and practices of French-English bilingual schooling in the 1920s may inform our understanding of FI as FSOL education a century later. Therefore, the research questions used to guide my inquiry are:

1. In what ways did Alberta's bilingual education research and policy reflect British bilingual education research and policy in the first quarter of the 20th century?
 - a) What were the views of key actors on bilingualism and second language learning?
 - b) How were the views present in Alberta's educational policy and practice in the 1920s?
 - c) Between 1907 and 1927, in light of two commissioned reports concerning the French-English schools in Ontario and a series of Imperial Education Conferences in London that dealt with bilingualism, how did public perception of French language education in Alberta change?

- d) How did British education innovations influence key actors at the University of Alberta to support French language education in Alberta in the 1920s?
 - e) Based on Kymlicka's arguments for minority rights, what is the significance of the Imperial Education Conferences, particularly that of 1923, regarding the way bilingual education was perceived in Alberta as part of the Dominion of Canada and the British Empire?
2. Informed by Kymlicka's principles, how do the insights from the 1920s help to understand the rising interest in FSOL education as a right in the current context?

The Researcher

I approach this research as a bilingual Franco-Albertan French Immersion teacher. I have completed two undergraduate degrees and one graduate degree in French at the University of Alberta's Campus Saint-Jean, after attending French immersion (FI) and Francophone education (FE) programs from K-12 in Edmonton, Alberta. I value the Government of Alberta's FI and FE programs as excellent approaches to becoming functional in both official languages of Canada.

Given my bias in favor of bilingual education, I recognize the need to be cautious with my interpretations, and make sure that they are sound and plausible; hence, great care was accorded to my methodology. At the same time, my background also motivated me to seek out more information pertaining to the context in order to make sense of things. Time, place, origin, and politics have influenced the way I approach bilingualism in education. As a bilingual researcher, living in a minority linguistic situation at a time

characterized by official language rights, I might be able to see things, to read between the lines, that other researchers had not, or could not have, highlighted. As such, my lived experiences helped shape my understanding and provided a different outlook on what has often been called (i.e. Auger, 2001), “the Dual-Language question” in education.

Significance of the Research

The project undertaken here is a socio-political history of French immersion (FI) education in Alberta. This research is meaningful because it builds upon the increasing corpus of sociological and political studies that look at FI from a historical and policy-making perspective. This project is distinct in that it concentrates on FI’s roots and the initial conditions that have shaped FI’s establishment and development in Alberta as a public education program, in the context of province-building policies couched in national citizenship formation.

This research is novel because of its focus on the 1920s, a period of Alberta’s history colored by British and imperial influences. The concerns regarding (French-English) bilingual education expressed in Alberta in the first quarter of the 20th century were very similar to those discussed at the Imperial Education Conferences in London, England by representatives from across the British Empire. As such, the 1923 conference recommendations on bilingual education were meant to be general enough to be applicable across borders, while providing a sound framework for regional governments and their national minorities. Perhaps these recommendations were also meant to stand the test of time because they are surprisingly applicable in contemporary discussions on bilingual education as well. Today like then, well-educated bilingual teachers are important to fill vacancies more easily, regardless of the unilingual or bilingual character

of the teaching assignment. The numbers of such teachers have a direct repercussion on the availability of bilingual education for another generation of students throughout their schooling. As such, knowledge of these recommendations and an understanding of their liberal premise may be key when contemplating the recognition of more inclusive rights to bilingual education in Alberta.

This study will provide insights that have the potential to help make sense of the present-day situation of FI in Alberta and the discussions surrounding FSOL education rights.

Delimitations

This project's overriding concerns are the policies and practices related to French/English bilingual education in Alberta in the 1920s. As such, priority will be given to sources emphasizing FI and French language education in this province. However, relevant information from other jurisdictions will also be used. The variety of sources will serve to inform our understanding of experience with French-English bilingual education in Alberta.

This project will acknowledge an extended time period in order to allow a big picture view of the development in Alberta of bilingual French-English education in general, as a precursor to FI in particular. However, this study will focus on the 1920s, when there occurred significant events in bilingualism research and second language education. This will not only demarcate this study from the majority of others that have looked to the St. Lambert, Quebec FI experiment in the 1960s as a point of departure, but it will include and rely on the western Canadian perspective, the relationship between Alberta and Ontario, as well as the provincial ties to Great Britain and the Empire. As

such, this project will explore the evolution of the political context of bilingual education in this province, with careful consideration of the motivations and concerns of those involved (i.e., the researchers, the policymakers, the school inspectors, the teachers, etc.) from those early years, within the framework of Kymlicka's two principles.

This approach will enable connections to be made between communities and levels of government not usually considered in discussions concerning FI and bilingualism in Canada. The influence of Britain throughout her empire was substantial, even as this empire was metamorphosing into the Commonwealth of Nations. The perception of Ontario by western Canadian provinces was also noteworthy. As such, the relationships between Great Britain, Ontario, and Alberta, will be important to examine, especially in terms of educational policies, practices, and research addressing bilingualism. This project will highlight events and conditions pertaining to bilingual education in Alberta leading up to and with emphasis on the 1920s, well ahead of FI's formal establishment in Alberta in the 1970s. The legacy of the 1920s may even still relate to current issues surrounding FI in Alberta today.

For reasons of continuity, this project relies on document analysis. Interviews and surveys were not required, given the rich availability of print material that has bearing on the subject of FI development in Alberta. Moreover, texts in either French or English are used and cited, as I had access to quality sources in both languages, in paper format or on-line, which provided different perceptions on the issue.

Limitations

This study looks to understand the situation of FI in Alberta from a particular point of view, informed by a limited window of time, and in reference to British

influences, all within the framework based on Kymlika's two principles. It is not intended as a historical sociology of FI in all of Canada, or even of the West. Nor is it intended as a complete chronology, as that would have been too heavy an undertaking for a thesis. Instead, it establishes the 1920s as an important decade in treating the question of bilingualism in education throughout the British Empire and to see how Alberta managed the issue of bilingual education up to and in the 1920s. These insights serve as points of reference to better understand the origins of FI in Alberta, as well the early history pertaining to minority French language education rights. The object is to make sense of the way the British thoughts about bilingual education in the 1920s may have been reflected in the policymaking and educational practices and research in Alberta in the 1920s. This exploration informs my understanding of French-English bilingual education as a process in Alberta; it possibly even provides insights into how that pedagogy came to be a beacon of FSOL education rights. Given the time and resource constraints, certain worthy clues were left unchecked, such as the examination of policies, research and practices pertaining to French language education in Alberta later than the 1930s and foregoing much of the literature on bilingualism in relation to cognitive development that has dominated bilingual and FI research in the 20th century. Although neuro-psychological concerns have always been an integral part of bilingualism research, the focus of this project rested primarily on the political and social aspects of bilingualism. Moreover, the findings are not meant to argue in favor of, or against, FSOL education rights. Rather, it is hoped they will add to a deeper understanding of FI's origins in Alberta, and that understanding may in turn provide insights to the reader concerning the issue of FSOL education rights.

Definitions

Allophone: A person for whom neither French nor English is the first language.

Anglophone: A person for whom English is the first language.

Francophone: Generally speaking, a person with French as a first language.

For a constitutional definition, please see s. 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) at:

<http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/pdp-hrp/canada/guide/mnrt-eng.cfm>

Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT/ACPI): a national organization of French immersion teachers.

Canadian Parents for French (CPF): a national parent based lobbyist organization with provincial chapters and school board representation. It encourages and makes available FSOL education research and promotes FSOL student activities (i.e. camps, public speaking galas).

French as a second official language (FSOL): terminology from Mady (2010) to more clearly identify the type of French language education under discussion.

French as a second language: Generally, in Canada, it is the umbrella designation for all programs that teach French as a second language, including Core French, FI, and Intensive French. However, in the Alberta context, FSL is the approximate equivalent of Core French elsewhere: the language is taught as a subject for a limited time per week. The aim of FSL in Alberta is to foster the development of rudimentary language skills in the student as well as a positive attitude towards the French language and its cultures.

French Canadian: For the purposes of this research, this designates a cultural group of people with ancestral roots in Canada from the period of French colonization of

New France. At the turn of the 20th century, French Canadians were predominantly Roman Catholic and those who spoke French spoke with a distinct accent from European French-speakers.

Organization of the Thesis

This thesis will be in ten chapters. The first chapters will be the introductory chapter, the literature review and the methodology chapters. The literature review is divided into four sections: a survey of some of the themes and concerns in bilingual education in the 1920s; their relevancy in later FI research; a review of the FI studies of a socio-political nature; and a review of the theoretical literature dealing with rights and citizenship within a liberal context. The methodology chapter explains how I intend to go about a case study along the lines of interpretive historical sociology. It will further establish how this work will be done based on document analysis, as well as address the timeframe that will be involved, in order to clearly establish how the research will proceed. To this original core will be added a chapter about the regional context at the turn of the 20th century, followed by two chapters on the Imperial Education Conferences of 1907, 1911, 1923 and 1927. A chapter about bilingual education in Alberta during the 1920s and another about the influence of British educational innovation in Alberta during that period will prepare the way for the chapter discussing some key arguments by Will Kymlicka in favor of group differentiated rights for national minority groups within a liberal state. The concluding chapter will review the work and explore its implications before proposing any recommendations

Chapter 2: The Literature Review

FI is an approach to language learning in public education where proficiency in both English and French is achieved by the teaching of academic content via the medium of the minority official language, French, to Anglophones and Allophones (Cohen & Swain, 1976; Genesee, 1987; Johnson & Swain, 1997; Stern, 1984). In Alberta, Francophone education (FE) provides French first-language education to Francophone students. In this province, where all students must learn English at school, FI and FE represent types of bilingual education in a French minority setting; and the history of one is intertwined with the history of the other, as evidenced in Martel (1991).

During the 1920s, educational bilingual policy discussions revolved around the Welsh Studies and the South African experience as evidenced at the Imperial Education Conference (1923). In this project, I explore how influential these ideas from Great Britain and Ontario played a role in Alberta's French language policies in education from that period. The objective is to ascertain how the British discussions about bilingualism in education were acknowledged in educational language policies, practice, and research in Alberta during the 1920s, and how the innovations of the 1920s may be subsequently relevant to enduring and present discussions concerning FSOL education (e.g., FI).

Although FI as a public school bilingual program has been well known since its emergence as a long-term pilot study in Montreal in the latter half of the 1960s, less is known today about bilingualism in education that preceded what has been termed "the immersion revolution" (cf. Foster, 1992, pp. iv, 4). As a result, rarely is earlier research thought to be relevant to more recent research in second language education; or that the occurrences in bilingual education research and policy in the first quarter of the quarter of

the 20th century from the UK, or those shared by the Imperial Education Conference delegates from Wales or South Africa, may be relevant to understanding the development of French-English bilingual education, especially of French immersion, in Alberta. This project is rooted in the 1920s, when bilingualism research and policymaking were at a crossroads between conventions and innovations, in order to inform our understanding of the progression in Alberta of French as second language education, especially as it pertains to FI, and some issues that surround FI as bilingual education, namely the interest in FSOL education rights.

As this project concerns itself with the 1920s, the research of the literature review will be presented in relation to the Welsh Studies (cf. Saer, Smith, & Hughes, 1924), the Imperial Education Conference (1923), and/or the prevalent discourses of Laurie (1889/1904) and Freeman (1879/1892) with regards to second language education. In this way, the literature review will instill a sense of familiarity with what was done in the early years. This will allow an appreciation of a lesser-known epoch of bilingualism/FI research in education and set the stage to discuss how the mentalities of the 1920s may still inform to the present circumstances surrounding FI in Alberta. With this in mind, the literature review is divided into four sections, reflective of the ongoing concerns in bilingual education and FI: bilingualism and intelligence; bilingualism and the workings of FI pedagogy; bilingualism and socio-political contexts; political concepts and bilingualism.

In the first two sections, special attention is given to studies in the earlier part of the 1900s and certain currents in bilingual education from those times are reflected in later works that have shaped 20th century bilingual education research and policy in

Alberta and Canada. The third section of the literature review will be devoted to the smaller but growing body of scholarship that discusses French language education in terms of socio-political relationships in society. The final section of my literature review will showcase works that explore the relationship between bilingualism, language rights, education and citizenship, within a liberal democratic context, to help frame my understanding of FI in Alberta. Throughout similarity or divergence of thoughts will be highlighted to help make explicit longstanding discussions regarding bilingualism.

Bilingualism and Intelligence

Language has long been viewed as the ultimate expression of intelligence and the truest expression of self. Throughout the 20th century, bilingualism research has been preoccupied with the language-intelligence relationship, as shown in Hamers and Blanc's (2000) review. Prior to the 1960s, bilingualism had only occasionally been perceived as a way to sharpen the intellect under certain conditions. Most often, second language acquisition was deemed to have negative effects on cognitive development, or at best, it was found to have no interference with intelligence at all. In the 1960s, new research in Montreal substantiated and legitimized the movement in bilingualism research that supported a positive relationship between bilingualism and cognitive development. The interest in measuring the effects of bilingualism on intellectual development, heralded at the Imperial Education Conference of 1923, captured the almost undivided attention of Canadian researchers in bilingualism until the 1990s.

Before the 1920s

As the first Bell Professor of Education at Edinburgh University (1876-1903), Simon Somerville Laurie was champion of a highly influential discourse in the field of education in the British Empire at the time when provincial culture in Alberta was taking shape. Throughout his career, Laurie strongly promoted better teacher training and greater freedom at the local level of education. In Laurie's (1889/1904) view, language study was a highly important aspect of schooling, even more so than the study of science, as language provided the best concrete application of formal logic and developed an appreciation of the patriotic discourse as well as the acquisition of universal knowledges. Opposed to bilingual education, Laurie (1889/1904) valued learning a second language in school only as so far as it would allow British pupils to better master the intricacies of their first language and appreciate the greatness of Britain as compared with accomplishments of other nations. In Laurie's opinion (1889/1904), learning a second language represented three things: training for the mind; discipline; and direct access to all that is beautiful and worthy in foreign cultures via their works of literature.

As Laurie believed that the first language was the best to express one's ideas, emotions, and reasoning, he considered that translations of foreign works could never transmit the same degree of clarity as the original text. For Laurie then, the ability to read foreign literature in the original language was to be encouraged because such an education would provide a deeper understanding of the world and by extension, the role of Great Britain within it. This deeper understanding would be achieved by the translations of foreign texts by the British student because the act of translating would necessarily draw out comparisons and contrasts between other cultures and languages and

the student's own. As such, the British student's understanding of the nuances and particularities of the English language would also be improved when confronted with the grammatical logic of another language, whether that language be classical (e.g., Latin, Greek), or modern (e.g., French, German).

In terms of dual language education, then, what mattered to Laurie was the mental stimulation provided by grammar-focused second language learning that would strengthen the British pupil's English language skills and cultural knowledge. Although Laurie did promote oral as well as written exercises in foreign language learning, especially in the case of a modern language such as French to which an entire chapter in his 1889/1904 book is devoted, such support for the acquisition of the foreign language was limited to the purpose of improving the pupil's command of the English language. Bilingualism in terms of fluency in two languages in which to live, work, or play, was to be avoided as it was deemed to result in limiting the cognitive development of the student and blur the sense of the British culture and identity. As described by Laurie,

If it were possible for a child or boy to live in two languages at once equally well, so much the worse for him. His intellectual and spiritual growth would not thereby be doubled, but halved. Unity of mind and of character would have difficulty in asserting itself in such circumstances Words . . . must be steeped in life to be living; and as we have not two lives, but only one, so we can have only one language. (Laurie, 1889/1904, pp.18-19)

Instead, according to Laurie (1889/1904), second language learning was to be taught efficiently: as a subject with an emphasis on grammar; for an allotted time per week; to students aged twelve years or older; for a period of three to six years if

possible¹. The purpose of second language education was to enable direct access to the literature written in the target language in order to increase the British student's sentiment of national pride, as well as his linguistic competency in English. In sum, the goal was to get sufficient skill in the second language in order to reinforce one's first language skills, and by extension, one's sense of membership in a great nation, but without inheriting the problems that were at the time believed to be associated with bilingualism.

The 1920s to 1950s, Including the Welsh Studies

With the popularization of psychometric tests in the early 20th century, bilingualism research in education had become largely about establishing a rapport between intelligence and linguistic skills. A bulk of the work had taken place in English speaking countries, especially the United States, although work had also been done elsewhere. A dominant theme in a large part of these studies was that bilingualism was a handicap: at the very least an academic impairment, or at worst, associated with delayed mental development. Examples of studies in bilingualism that showed varying degrees of negative findings are Darcy (1946), Graham (1926), Jones and Stewart (1951), Meade (1927), Pintner (1932), Pintner and Keller (1922), Saer (1923), Smith (1923), as well as Smith (1939). In California, Yoshioka (1929) had felt that learning a second language was an overwhelming task for younger students.

However, not all the early research conducted had found fault with bilingualism. Such were the conclusions of Hill (1936), McCarthy (1929), and Pintner and Arsenian

¹ This intense grammar-focused approach is also key to Dr. Hector Hammerly's proposal to fix FI's failings (Hammerly 1987, 1989). Although Hammerly approved of FI's objective of functional bilingualism, he felt it could never be achieved without overhauling the FI pedagogy to into something that largely resembled, an approach that had been championed generations earlier by Laurie.

(1937), for example. Moreover, bilingualism research had attracted attention not only in the USA, the UK and Europe, but in Canada as well. In Alberta, the topic of French-English bilingual schooling motivated Gibault (1939) to draw comparisons between Francophone and Anglophone students in the St. Paul region. Gibault (1939) looked at how these groups compared within the context of a French-English education² and how they compared with students from English schools. An important purpose of this study was to determine the effects of such a bilingual education on English language skills. Gibault (1939) concluded that bilingual education did not impede student development. As such, the conclusion drawn in the bilingualism research in Alberta was not an anomaly, but in step with what had been expressed elsewhere.

In hindsight, the same could be said of the conclusions of the Welsh studies, a series of long term research studies in Wales circa 1920 and reported by both Saer (1923) and Smith (1923) in the *British Journal of Psychology* and the subject of a book (Saer, Smith and Hughes, 1924). In an historical view, the Welsh Studies seem to have been more of a critique of the manner in which bilingual education had been dispensed in a context of a minority language population schooled in the majority language, as opposed to a critique of bilingualism in education as such³. In fact, Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924) had suggested that bilingual education for both Welsh and English children in Wales should be encouraged. This would require, however, a different approach in the schools and they illustrated examples where such change had occurred. Saer, Smith and Hughes' (1924) book was timely as it loosely coincided with the Imperial Education

² Gibault (1939, p. 1) used the term 'French-English education' as opposed to the more habitual 'bilingual education' because he felt it was a more accurate designation.

³ In general, such as demonstrated in Yoshioka (1929), Saer (1923) had been understood to mean that bilingualism education was a hindrance among Welsh children.

Conference (1923) and confirmed the conference's six adopted principles, dealing with teacher education and teaching practices in the context of promoting for all students of a bilingual region, a quality bilingual education in English, as well as in the recognized minority language and its literature.

The distinction between bilingualism and the ways in which bilingual students were educated became noticed in other studies as well. Malherbe (1946/1978) in South Africa had found that Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking children attending dual-medium bilingual schools where both languages were used to convey instruction had better second language skills and academic results than unilingual students in unilingual schools. Moreover, this was true even for those students that Malherbe had deemed of "the lower intelligence groups" (Malherbe, 1946/1978, p. 117). When comparing bilingual students, Hill (1936) had found that those who had been dominant in the school language upon starting school had done better than those who had been dominant in their home language upon starting school in tests that had required average understanding of the school language and its use. However, in tests that had required a superior understanding of the school language and the way it could be used, the opposite had been true. Other researchers had also found that on certain tests, bilingual students outperformed monolingual students (Arsenian, 1937/1972; Axelrod 1951/1978; Darsie, 1926; Malherbe 1946/1978; Spoerl, 1944; Stark, 1940). If Arsenian (1937/1972) and Stark (1940) had gone so far as to suggest that bilingualism could potentially be cognitively advantageous, Malherbe (1946/1978) had clearly stated that children from bilingual homes were indeed more intelligent. Such admissions were something that even Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) had reservations.

New Findings Based on Student Contexts

Psychometric tests, though popular, had not been uncontested, nor had such testing been the only method available to researchers prior to the 1960s. McCarthy (1929), one of few women researchers, had cast doubt on the validity of test results that did not take into consideration the test-subject's contexts. Meade (1927), another woman in research, had indicated that exclusive use of such testing would disadvantage foreign children in public schools. Mitchell (1937) had made similar conclusions: foreign-language-speaking students in English language American schools were found to be at a disadvantage and English language intelligence tests could not accurately reflect these students' intelligence levels, regardless of any corrective measures that might be devised. Johnson (1953) had illustrated the difficulty in measuring bilingual children's intelligence levels through tests, especially when administered in the English language to non-English first language bilingual children. He expressed doubt vis-à-vis the validity of the results from such tests. Levinson (1959) had also questioned the validity or scope of intelligence tests for the bilingual child, given that collected data indicated that bilingual Jewish children's IQ rates had risen significantly between the start of their schooling and the later half of primary school.

Upon closer examination of the 1920s era Welsh Studies' data, Lewis (1960) had found that linguistic environment as opposed to intelligence may have played a more significant role in the discrepancy in academic achievement between bilingual and monolingual Welsh students. When Jones (1960) had analyzed the same data, the differences between bilingual students and monolingual students had been found to be significantly associated with the student's SES, as opposed to his or her intelligence.

Hence, Jones (1960) concluded that bilingualism was not a cause of what he termed “intellectual disadvantage” (p.74).

Peal and Lambert (1962) had also found the conclusions of earlier studies dealing with intelligence and bilingualism to be problematic. Contrary to many such earlier studies, Peal and Lambert’s Québec study found that bilingual students outperformed monolingual students. Moreover, they, like some earlier research already mentioned, found evidence that suggested bilingualism enhanced cognitive development. Peal and Lambert believed their findings to be true because they had taken into account various factors that other researchers with negative findings had not done. As a result, Peal and Lambert discredited a good number of previous studies on methodological grounds and they concluded that the negative findings of many bilingualism studies were of dubious value.

Hazard and Stent (1971) had further argued that in the 1950s and 1960s intelligence tests had been administered to bilingual children in a manner that would prejudice the results, resulting in their placement in special classes for challenged students.

Bilingualism Evaluated Without Psychometric Testing

In light of the controversy concerning intelligence testing, some researchers opted to follow a completely different approach from their contemporaries in bilingual research. Examples are Ronjat (1914), Pavlovitch (1920), and Grégoire (1947) in Europe, as well as Leopold (1939, 1949) in the USA. Having studied young children in their home environment over a period of years and having compared them to their friends, these authors had found that bilingualism did indeed provide positive mental stimulation. They

observed that bilingual children developed intellectually in ways that monolingual or unilingual children did not, while not suffering any impediment in other aspects of their growth and learning.

Summary of the First Section

This first section of the literature review has concentrated on presenting the bilingualism research that examined the possible relationship between intelligence and bilingualism. The majority of these studies presented took place prior the 1960s but any review of Canadian research since the 1960s (e.g.s., Hamers & Blanc, 2000; Baker & Hornberger, 2001) will show that cognitive development remained a concern in bilingual education (e.g., Genesee, 1976). However, in the 1920s, Welsh research and British policy principles espoused a modified perception from the dominant discourse at the time and promoted the implementation of bilingual education, based on the premise that a good bilingual education was not harmful. In Alberta, Gibault's (1939) findings supported this view. As the controversy over methodology of psychometric tests grew, awareness of student contexts took on greater importance.

Bilingualism and Pedagogy

Encouraged by the positive findings in some early bilingualism studies (cf. Gibault, 1939; Ronjat, 1914), research increasingly approached bilingualism as an enigma to figure out in order to unlock its potential benefits. New insights about how second languages were learned established a basis for a new pedagogy of second language education in Canada: French immersion. This innovative public school program was the object of countless studies that have revolved around many of the same concerns that had been expressed in the Welsh Studies and the Imperial Education Conference of

the 1920s. Increasingly, it was found that contextual factors as well as psychological factors affected the bilingual learning experience. Many of the topics highlighted in this section are also explored in Archibald, Roy, Harmel and Jesney's (2004) survey of second language research requested by the government of Alberta, and in Bournot-Trites and Tallowitz's (2002) report for the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation.

Factors of Bilingualism

In Québec, Gardner and Lambert (1959) had found that motivation played a role in language learning. They established a grading system that they labeled an 'Orientation Index'. This Orientation Index made a distinction between instrumental bilingualism, where the second language was learned for utilitarian ends, and integrative bilingualism, where the second language was learned for the sake of learning it and for the pleasure to appreciate its various forms (e.g., literature) and speech communities. Increasingly, motivation became a focal point of bilingualism research in Canada (cf. Clément, Smythe, & Gardner, 1978; Gardner, 1985, 1986; Gardner & Smythe, 1975; Lambert, Gardner, Barik & Turnstall, 1963). In Viljoen's conference presentation in 1923, official bilingualism in South Africa and the promotion of a bilingual education was based on civic issues, incorporating both instrumental motivation (e.g., teaching and educational administrative positions), as well as integrative motivation (e.g., to be able to speak to your neighbour).

Concurrently, Penfield (1965) had found that second language learning could benefit from simulating a more natural approach, confirming Viljoen's position in 1923 and the South African approach to second language learning by starting with conversational skills as early as possible. Just as a child did not acquire her first language

through concentrated effort in grammar study, Penfield argued that second language acquisition could also be learned in a more organic way. This, like Viljoen's presentation at the Imperial Education Conference of 1923, was a marked deviation from Laurie's approach to second language learning and reflected much of what Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) had discussed.

Furthermore, Dr. Wallace Lambert's distinction between additive and subtractive bilingualism provided pivotal insights into the complexities of bilingualism. Simply put, additive bilingualism was the result of learning a second language without detriment to the first language, whereas subtractive bilingualism was the result of losing one's first language skills while learning a second language (Lambert, 1973/1975, 1974). This identification helped explain some of the inconsistencies in the data from pre-1960 studies where it has been noted that at times, bilingual children had performed well, and at other times, bilingual children had not performed well. Even Viljoen's conference presentation in 1923 had alluded to possible situations where the student was best to further their schooling in their first language only. Lambert's innovative thinking therefore legitimized the positions of those in the 1920s who had argued that contextual factors could positively or negatively influence the nature of the bilingual experience.

Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924) had in fact advocated for a new style of bilingual education to be based on credible evidence in order to present parents with a legitimate option for their children. As such, bilingualism research and debate in the 1920s increasingly defied traditional hegemony in second language education. Not only might bilingualism have not negatively affected what Laurie (1889/1904) had termed "unity of mind and character" (p. 18), but it may have had positive effects. Moreover, the growing

shift in bilingualism research also went against the grain of Freeman's views concerning the cycle of languages where it was expected that some would outlast and replace others. This refutation of the necessity of linguistic assimilation was accompanied with greater demand for official minority language education, as presented at the Imperial Education Conference of 1923 and Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924). The promotion of an education aimed at developing functional bilingualism for citizenship and nation-building purposes had been greatly discussed at the 1923 Imperial Education Conference, long before functional bilingualism through education was promoted in Canada (cf. Peal and Lambert, 1962; Lambert and Tucker, 1972).

The attention to method and motivation in second language acquisition, as well as the elaboration of conditions under which bilingualism could be beneficial, had been built upon the premise of the value of a new approach to second language learning in bilingual countries (cf. Imperial government, 1926; Saer, Smith, and Hughes, 1924) and became the basis of the revolutionary FI pedagogy in Canada starting in the 1960s. To be clear, the idea of immersion was not new—Carey (1989) pointed out that immersion situations had existed throughout history at least as far back as the Romans. However, FI's intended application in public education settings across Canada to a heterogeneous student population, in different language dominant contexts, made this concept revolutionary.⁴

⁴ The Welsh immersion type of experiment reported in Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924) had occurred only in Wales, not elsewhere; in the South African context, the indigenous populations were not mentioned (Malherbe 1946/1971); however at the 1927 IEC, there was talk of the benefits of Indigenous-English bilingual education for the British expatriated child in tropical lands.

Research Trends in Bilingual Education/FI

In the 1920s, as in later years, research in bilingualism has focused on similar topics: teacher education, teaching methods, program evaluation, and student participation and performance. Canadian FI empirical research has often compared different FI student groups (Barik, Swain, & Nwanunobi, 1977; Guimont, 2003; Lapkin, Hart, & Swain, 1991) or FI groups and English mainstream education groups (Barik & Swain, 1976; Hart, Lapkin & Swain, 1989b; Lapkin, Hart, & Turnbull, 2003) to ascertain how cognitive growth was affected by FI education. As a result, FI research in Canada has included program evaluations⁵ (Bibeau, 1991; Day & Shapson, 1996; Edmonton Public Schools, 2002; Halsall, 1989; Lazaruk, 2007; Swain, 1974; Swain & Lapkin, 1982), program implementation (Cadez, 2006; Guimont, 2003; Halsall, 1989; Hart, Lapkin, & Swain, 1988, 1989a, 1989b; Hildebrand, 1974; Jones, 1984; Shapson & Kaufman, 1978), teacher education (Obadia, 1984a, 1984b; Obadia, Roy, Saunders, Tafler, & Wilton, 1983; Pons-Ridler, 1977; Stern, 1970; Tardif, 1984) and teaching strategies (Bilash, 1998; Day & Shapson, 2001; Lavallée, 1990; Stern, 1978; Tardif, 1994; Webber, 1990). Still other researchers have looked at the retention/attrition trend in FI across the country (Bonan, 2004; Dubé, 1993; Obadia & Thériault, 1997; Wilton, 1974), especially at the junior and senior high levels of school (Cadez, 2006; Culligan 2010; Foster, 1992, 1998; Halsall, 1994, 1998; Makropoulos, 2005, 2010). Different studies have looked at FI high school graduates and their university experiences in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada (cf. Edwards, 1991; Kaufman & Shapson, 1978; Marshall & Laghzaoui, 2012; Skogen, 2006).

All these contemporary concerns about teacher education for bilingual teaching, and the effect of bilingualism in education on students' overall development throughout grade school and post-secondary echoed similar to concerns raised during the Welsh Studies of the 1920s and the Imperial Education Conference of 1923. Even the designation of the appropriate target population for bilingual education has been a timeless preoccupation.

Bilingual Education/FI, Home Language, and SES

Many studies have been contributions in a larger debate that has revolved around the suitability of bilingual education for all students and to what degree. These questions have been addressed along the lines of linguistic heritage and socio-economic status (SES).

At first, the focus of research had been to examine a simple duality of language backgrounds. Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) had mainly reported on the English and the Welsh students in Wales. The South African presentation at the Imperial Education Conference (1923) by Viljoen, as well as the research by Malherbe (1946/1978), had predominantly dealt with English and Afrikaans speakers. In Alberta, Gibault (1939) had limited his research to English and French speakers, as did Lambert and Tucker (1972) in Québec. However, many classrooms were and are much more pluralistic. This was even recognized in 1923 by Viljoen: he acknowledged at the conference that when students had a home language other than Afrikaans or English, legislative provisions allowed these students to receive instruction in their first language. For their part, Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) had noted the different linguistic context in Rhondda, Wales, where there was a greater concentration of multiple ethnic groups where the children were striving to

speak Welsh. Upon a review of the Welsh Studies' data, Lewis (1960) had also stressed the importance of the student linguistic background factor in the Welsh bilingual education experience.

In Canada, Green (1978) had advised that more care would be needed to respond to the changing needs of the increasingly multicultural student body in public education, including that of FI classrooms where the challenge became apparent in teaching Canada's two official languages while maintaining the home language. A large body of FI research in Canada has therefore focused on the conditions and experiences of FI students of different language backgrounds (Dagenais, 2003; Dagenais & Day, 1998,1999; Dagenais, Day, & Toohey, 2006; Dagenais & Moore, 2008; Genesee, 1991; Hart, Lapkin, & Swain, 1988; Mady, 2013; Mady & Turnbull, 2012; Prasad, 2012; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Swain & Lapkin, 2005; Taylor, 1992; Tarone & Swain, 1995).

Another factor in bilingual education has been found to be the socio-economic class. In his review of the Welsh Studies' data, Jones (1960) had argued that SES was a determining factor of the Welsh Studies' students' academic performance. Given the recognized importance of SES, there have been many studies that have attempted to address the needs of second language students of lower SES (Engel de Abreu, Cruz-Santos, Tourinho, Martin & Bialystok, 2012; Genesee, 1991). In light of the changing understanding of bilingual education factors, today as in the past, there is a call for more empirical testing in order to compare with/confirm earlier research results and ensure a positive experience for all students (Bournot-Trites & Reeder, 2001).

Summary of the Second Section

In the 1920s, the growing attention to factors influencing bilingualism modified the object of bilingualism research to include concern about how different approaches to bilingualism affected the person as a productive member of society.

Socio-political and Historical Research in Bilingual Education/FI

In the second half of the 20th century, the findings in bilingualism research repeatedly promoted the benefits of a bilingual education. These works increased the awareness of context when dealing with second language acquisition that had germinated in the early part of the century. For example, Roy (2007) had looked at how socio-cultural theory-based teaching could enhance FI students' second language experience because of the emphasis placed on authentic social interaction. Roy (2007) had concluded that there was more to second language learning than grammatical knowledge: second language learning involved contextual knowledge as well. This renewed attention to the conditions that affect bilingualism echoed Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) and Viljoen in 1923. In addition to this growing acknowledgement of social context, there occurred a shift to include socio-political interests in bilingualism studies (e.g., Burns & Olson, 1983; Heller, 1990; Roy, 2008) that have added to the corpus of bilingualism research.

French-English Bilingual Education

In the first half of the 20th century, awareness of the importance of context when studying bilingualism had been somewhat marginalized by the popularity of objective intelligence tests. Nevertheless, there had been some studies, like Pavlovitch (1920) and Leopold (1939, 1949) that had observed bilingual children over time and in consideration of their contexts. Whereas these examples could be said to have been limited to the

education of children of bilingual parents who could afford travel, and who had nannies and tutors, other studies looked at the conditions of bilingual education.

Toussaint (1935) had looked at the schooling systems of many different European countries where bilingualism transcended socio-economic class. His findings indicated that bilingual education varied in results along with the methods employed. Moreover, Toussaint concluded that bilingual education was not simply a matter of isolated pedagogy, but was an issue directly affected by the political decisions and prevailing socio-economic conditions. For example, Toussaint had found that minority groups' bilingualism was affected by the way different European countries respected their language education reciprocity agreements. On a more local level, in the case of his native Belgium, he had found that Flemish speaking children in border areas did better in acquiring French as their second language when they boarded at the school on the French speaking side of the border, as opposed to those who returned home from school across the border every evening (Toussaint, 1935). Such observations were not so different from those made by Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) in regard to the immersion of Anglophone students in a Welsh-speaking school context located in the English-speaking Welsh town of Wrexham.

In his exposé of Bishop Francis Fallon during the period 1909 until 1931, Farrell (1968) illustrated how bilingual schools in Ontario were seen by some influential members of Ontario's English speaking society, such as the bishop, as an economic problem, both for French-speaking students and the greater society. Feeling that the students were not getting a proper education in either language, Bishop Fallon was particularly aggrieved by the resulting inability of these students to enjoy the socio-

economic benefits that accompanied a quality English language education in an English speaking society. According to Farrell (1968), the bishop, though originally from Ireland and fluent in French and English himself, was nevertheless a staunch British Imperialist who opposed bilingual schools in early 20th century Ontario.

Recalling Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) who structured their introductory chapter as a historical account of Welsh as a language in education and public life in Wales up to the 1920s, Safty (1988) recounted the French language story in Canada. Safty (1988) retraced French-English bilingualism in Canada to the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and quickly sketched the historical context of its evolution until the late 20th century. She acknowledged some of the typical findings in bilingualism research before the 1960s and afterwards, as well as the contexts in which they were produced. She reported the praises of FI programs in terms of cognitive advantages and its suitability for all students; she refuted its critics, namely Hammerly (1982, 1983) and Trites (1976). She illustrated how FI has become a victim of its own success, and how sometimes, measures have been taken to limit the expansion of the FI program, such as in New Brunswick and in Saanich, B. C. All this was done to underscore how public perception, local context and politics have had a role in FI program implementation, development, and administration. Safty (1988) argued that FI has not simply been an effective approach to teach and learn two languages, it has been a way to instill new meaning in Canadian citizenship.

Gagnon (1989) explored the interests that shaped the privately operated the Couvent de l'Assomption in Edmonton, Alberta between 1923 and 1960. According to Gagnon (1989), this Catholic boarding school was well known for its educational

excellence, despite teaching too much (in) French, at a time when French language education was severely curtailed in Alberta and prior to the formal recognition of FI in this province. Gagnon (1989) illustrated the importance of this Edmonton boarding school for girls in the French-speaking communities of Alberta. Moreover, she provided insights into the motivations and the ways teachers, parents, and even the media worked at circumventing certain educational policies while inspectors, satisfied with the overall results, refrained from increasing governmental interference in the school's management.

Mahé (1993) followed the trail of teachers in bilingual school settings of Alberta, between 1892 and 1992, and noted the changes that had occurred in the curriculum and in the practices over a formative one hundred year period. Of particular interest was her observation that over time, the teaching practices had shifted from emphasizing a separate curriculum in French than in English, to teaching a core common curriculum, regardless of the program, FI or other. This integrative practice seems to be in alignment with the fourth principle of the principles for bilingual teaching from the 1923 Imperial Education Conference, that stated that:

in the cases where the two languages . . . are both highly developed and possess an adequate literary content, instruction in them both should thenceforth proceed concurrently, where the organization of the school permits, throughout the . . . school course. (p. 291)

This practice ensured that while the particular needs of French language education students were addressed, the quality of their overall education did not suffer. Of sociological importance in education, this safeguarded against the marginalization of bilingual education and the creation of a two-tiered education system. It also ensured that

a plural view of society, reflective of the heterogeneity in the province's population and part of the core curriculum outlook, would be presented to all students, regardless of the setting or the language of instruction.

Steeped in Gramsci's views of hegemony, Mahé (2001) reflected upon the resistance of Francophone communities in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba to the assimilative efforts of the respective provincial ministries of Education in the first four decades of the 20th century. In particular, she explained the difficulties that French-speaking school inspectors and teachers faced, torn between cultural sympathies for their language and faith communities and the danger of losing their jobs and work qualifications.

Gidney and Millar (2012) illustrated the reality of conditions that public schools in English speaking parts of the country operated in between 1900 and 1940. Of particular interest are their accounts of academic achievement of students of British ancestry as compared to others and how this fuelled repressive measures against French-English schools in Ontario. The poor academic achievement of students at these schools prompted the government to take measures beyond what had been proposed by Merchant (1912). The authors report how the fallout of the controversial Regulation XVII and Regulation XVIII resulted in the establishment of the Scott-Merchant-Côté Commission (1927) in order to find solutions to the bilingual schooling problem in Ontario.

Summary of the Third Section

So far, this review of the FI literature has reflected the general acknowledgement that a big change in bilingualism research occurred in the 1960s but that the change had been brewing since the 1920s. These works are indicative of a growing interest to frame

bilingual education research to account for the contexts, to make links with policy, and to include more theory oriented work as well as more qualitative studies to further sustain, develop, and enhance bilingual education such as FI pedagogy and practice as supported by Tardif and Weber (1987), and Roy (2008).

Given the increased awareness of the effects of context in FI, the next part of the literature review will examine some political ideas that have framed or otherwise influenced the development of FI. These works, addressing the notions of citizenship and rights within a liberal democracy, will provide a context that will serve to better inform our understanding of the FI literature. Kymlicka's work in particular will be important to the shaping of this present study.

Theoretical Framework

In order to help me make sense of the bilingualism studies and FI research presented above, and of the findings in my research, some theoretical guidelines are required. As such, my project is informed by various scholarly works on liberalism and citizenship, including language uses, language education and rights.

Liberalism and Language Use

For Kymlicka (1995/2000), right and left wing liberalism have been fundamentally in agreement about claims of rational revisability (guaranteed access to liberal education and freedom to change) and the non-perfectionist state (the neutral state vis-à-vis the conception of whatever individuals may find personally advantageous). However, in the context of inequalities resulting from circumstance rather than by choice, there has been disagreement. The right wing liberal would uphold individual freedom over state intervention, whereas a left wing liberal would promote state intervention in

order to ensure individual freedom for all. In this sense, justice (the right) has become the benchmark, not only to differentiate the types of liberalism, but, to protect the individual's agency within society.

Based on this benchmark of justice, Kymlicka (1995/2000) formulated two postulates of a liberal democracy with implications for language use. First, in a liberal and democratic multi nations-state, differentiated group rights enable the individual group members to more fully participate in the shared public polity. Second, the State has an obligation towards national minorities to support their development, by establishing conditions of growth similar to that of the majority group. If generalized participation in public life is facilitated when the people's language is employed, then this must be taken into account when establishing favorable conditions for both the national minority and the majority groups. The principles from the Imperial Conference on Education (1923), as will be discussed in Chapter 6, seem to rest upon similar logic.

The power associated with a given language can be based on the number of its speakers, the geographical dispersion of its speakers, its cultural relevancy (representation in the Arts and Science), and/or its associated economic benefits. These factors help determine the social pull of a language and its status as majority or minority language, according to Noël (1989).⁶ As observed Tardif (1990), the majority language speakers' understanding of the value of the minority language has a great effect on how the minority language and its native speaking community will flourish.⁷ Bain (1985) added that minorities desire to both, take part in the greater society with its socio-

⁶ Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) speak of a language's power much in the same way.

⁷ This echoes Axelrod (1951/1978) and Malherbe (1946/1978) who recognized the relationship between the majority language speakers' views of the minority language and the minority language children's language skills in both languages.

economic advantages, and do so without losing their language. As such, Noël (1989) found that class dictates much about how a minority group will learn the dominant language, and its own language as well.

Foucher (2008) and Aunger (2002, 2008) have maintained that public institutions and networks are important in terms of language function, as they create spaces that may be supportive or restrictive of minority language use.⁸ Aunger (1996), Mady, Black, and Fulton (2010), Cooper, Fusarelli, and Randall (2004), and Romaine (2004), all argued that formal policies can represent a conduit for, or a safeguard against, intentional or accidental educational innovation and improvement.

Manzer (1994, 2003) presented a comprehensive evolution of liberal theory as it has influenced the development of public education in Canada and other English speaking liberal democracies. Covering the timeframe from the mid 19th century until the late 20th century, Manzer (1994) identified four successive forms of liberalism (political, economical, ethical and technological) in Canada. He explained how these ideologies had an impact on public education philosophies throughout the country. Manzer (1994) further provided a sense of how FI's emergence and development might have been affected .

The important effect of political ideological underpinnings of public schooling was not lost on Mallea (1985) who claimed that schools are not only integrated into societal culture, but that they are means of political and socio-economic aspirations. Aunger (1989b) had argued that public recognition and perception of a language,

⁸ Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924) demonstrated supporting evidence for this in the case of the revival of the Welsh language in Wales as it became a part of the curriculum and benefitted from governmental offices dedicated to its promotion.

especially a minority language, are closely associated with education because teaching a language is a political act. Given the political nature of language education, Martel (2001) credited the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) for having confirmed the credibility and legitimacy of French language education in minority contexts.

All this writing contrasts with the works of Dr. Edward A. Freeman, an Oxford University Regius Professor of Modern History at a time when linguistic plurality was deemed a menace to the preservation of the Nation-State. The popularity of Freeman's ideas were at their height in the turn of the 20th century, coinciding with what Manzer (1994) identified as a period of political liberalism, mentioned above. Freeman (1879/1892), argued that national unity rested ideally on the principle of one language, one nation, one state. Although he admitted that the alignment between language, nation and government was not always the case, and that perhaps more examples of exceptions existed than examples that confirmed the rule, it was his opinion that nothing should detract from the ideal that in the West, a nation, a government and a language should coincide. Moreover, if a language other than the dominant language was spoken, Freeman (1879/1892) felt this practice should remain an exception. Whereas he freely refuted purity of bloodlines as a requirement of a nation, given the extent to which European nations had been formed by what he often referred to as 'adoption and assimilation', Freeman (1879/1892) was adamant that one shared language was the ideal situation for a western nation. The notion that one language could replace another fitted well with what Freeman (1879/1892) called "the doctrine of unbroken continuity of history" (p. v) to describe the evolving human story of the perpetual re-adjustment of

groups of people and their practices according to changing political factors. For Freeman, then, modern history was the outcome of the Roman Empire and, just as Latin had replaced Greek when the context had changed, some languages replace others when their situations changed.

According to Aunger (2001), by the dawn of the 20th century there were a number of English-speaking politicians in Canada who were entirely convinced by Freeman's discourse, such as D'Alton McCarthy, MP for Simcoe-North, Ontario, and members of the Northwest Assembly, such as Frank Oliver (Edmonton), Thomas Tweed (Medicine Hat), and Daniel Mowat (South Regina). For Aunger (2001), Frederick Haultain's 1892 resolution that banned French from schools in the Northwest Territories was an expression of Freeman's Nation-State principle in that it promoted one language in the public arenas, including schools, in order to promote a model of Anglo-dominant society to be recreated in the burgeoning soon-to-be province of Alberta. Saer, Smith, and Hughes' (1924) report of the inclusion of Welsh as a subject of study for Welsh students in the recognized curriculum in Wales the following year would likely have been deemed an exception to the rule by Professor Freeman, and not to be encouraged.

Citizenship: Language, Education, and Rights

Despite Freeman's (1879/1892) longstanding and widely published views with regards to the ideal of one shared language for a nation, Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924) indicated that learning both languages in the bilingual regions of Great Britain would increase a shared sense of patriotism. Likewise, Martin (1993) affirmed that a distinctive quality of Canadian citizenship has rested on the knowledge of either French or English. Moreover, since the 1940s period evoked in Martin (1993), citizenship has become an

important aspect of official languages' education, as evidenced by Pal (1993) and Carr (2013), for example. Cairns and Williams (1985) spoke of citizenship in terms of accommodation to promote equality. In his discussion of benefits of citizenship, Morton (1993) singled out the right to French or English language education in Canada. For Morton (1993), citizenship evoked rights, and rights ensured choices, as opposed to impositions. Like Saer, Smith, and Hughes (1924) in regard to Welsh-English education, Lamoureux (1974) made a case that a bilingual education, one that will fulfill the needs of both the students and their society, should be a choice available to parents for their children in Alberta. Swerhun (1981) was like-minded: he concluded that a bicultural⁹ education promoted choice, whereas assimilationist¹⁰ education reduced it.

This being said, Biesta and Lawy (2006) were weary of the neo-liberal concept of citizenship education that equated a citizen with a consumer, and emphasized social rights as market rights and the freedom to choose among them. For them, citizenship was about individuals participating in the democratic process to ensure the sharing of resources among the population. This could best occur when the individual citizen was not considered independently from the context but as embedded in it. Accordingly, Biesta and Lawy (2006) felt that citizenship education must propose citizenship as being an active process, something to be practiced within a context.

⁹ For Swerhun (1981), bicultural education incorporates the minority and majority languages as vehicles of instruction and as such, it can be understood as bilingual education.

¹⁰ Swerhun (1981) identified assimilationist education as an expression of anglo-conformity ideology that characterized Canadian society until WWII and that presumed the inherent superiority of British institutions and values. Canadian unity was thought to be highly dependent on the assimilation of cultural groups, immigrant or not, to become Anglo-Saxon in every possible way. Monocultural and monolingual schooling was pivotal in this enterprise.

In their discussion, Knopff and Morton (1985) delineated how official bilingualism in Canada has been a means to promote national citizenship over regional interests. They explored multiculturalism and bilingualism as complementary policies, meant to enhance national unity. Recognizing the Charter as being key to national unity, the two authors perceived the Charter as an invitation to the courts to reconcile national rights of citizenship with provincial legislative responsibilities. Given the tensions within the discourse of unity, Cairns (1993) concluded that the future of Canada depends on recognition and respect of difference without losing sight of what is held in common. This idea of bilingualism for social harmony had previously resonated in Wales in the 1920s, as demonstrated in Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924), and in South Africa, as recognized at the Imperial Education Conference (1923).

The appeal of a social equilibrium is also evident in Hazard and Stent (1971), who argued that cultural pluralism was a fact of life that must be dealt with justly in order for a multicultural country to be united. In their view, cultural pluralism is steeped in respect for (as opposed to begrudging tolerance of) differences among people. Cultural pluralism is more than simple gestures in public policy such as a celebratory day. Cultural pluralism is characterized by a shared commitment to equality of opportunities, including the recognition of equitable arrangements. Cultural pluralism allows for an awareness of oppressive forces, such as assimilation, and the understanding that people of different cultures and languages have a right to oppose these forces and negotiate how they will enter society and live within it.

Swerhun (1981) found that pluralism can be seen either as strictly in terms of the preservation of each separate minority group, or as the development of the individual's

many cultural affiliations. Swerhun (1981) noted that the potential for problems in the latter view rested in the possible contradictions in the individual's cultural aspirations, where the will of the individual to integrate into the larger socio-economic structure of society and reap its benefits, was in conflict with the group's desire to maintain its traditional ways.

Kymlicka (2001) elaborated that citizenship education in a liberal democracy entailed more than simply transmitting the knowledge of how democracy worked; it was about investing generations of people with a commitment to liberal ideals about the good and the right, as well as with a unifying allegiance to one another. Accordingly, Kymlicka's citizenship education had five goals: to instill a sense of agency and desire to question societal mechanisms; to show various yet reasonable interpretations of the good life; to respect and include diversity; to interiorize shared liberal values and a sense of community that transcend individual or group differences; and to engage people in common public institutions, in one common language, in order to reinforce one common history. It follows, then, that the choice of subjects as well as the manner in which they are taught are intimately bound with the purpose of liberal citizenship education. In a way, then, Kymlicka (2001) was not so different from Laurie (1889/1904) and Freeman (1879/1892) and herein lies the tension. How can the caveat, whereby public life is to be enjoyed in one common language, be reconciled with the notion of differentiated group rights of a national minority?

Echoing Freeman (1879/1892), Kymlicka (2001) wrote that liberal democracies have tended to emphasize one language and one history as a means to instill in the citizens a sense of belonging. Reminiscent of Laurie's (1889/1904) importance of

expression in the native tongue, Kymlicka (2001) also stated that political participation in a liberal democracy is facilitated when the people can discuss the issues in their own language. As such, Kymlicka (2001) acknowledged the benefits of a territorial-based language arrangement within a multination state.

In contrast, however, other contemporary scholars, such as Aunger (2002, 2008) and Couture (2001), have found such an arrangement to be problematic as it can imply a contradiction to the precept of respectful accommodation of diversity, especially for members of a national minority outside the area where they constitute a majority. Moreover, even in a situation where one language was recognized as the common medium of communication, such a position would not necessarily be closed to the promotion of an additional language. This was the position held close to a century ago by C. B. Sissons (1917) who, upon recognizing the permanence of the French language presence in Canada, encouraged all Canadians to acquire some degree of knowledge about it and its literary works. Digressing from Laurie (1889/1904), and in opposition to Freeman (1879/1892), Sissons (1917) also proclaimed that one's patriotic duty as a Canadian was associated with breaking down language barriers, getting to know one's own fellow citizens, and learning to appreciate the similarities and differences as part of "a perfect national symphony" (p. 214). Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924) echoed his sentiment in Wales, as did Viljoen's report of the Union of South Africa in 1923.

Kymlicka (2007) agreed that to achieve a form of just societal integration that is required for future national growth, there is a need to bridge the gap between the majority Anglophone group and the three main minority groups in Canada, those being the Aboriginal and the Francophone national minorities, as well as, in Kymlicka's terms, the

Immigrant/Ethnic populations. Likewise, McMurtry (2007) advocated for increased connections between people throughout society, especially where official bilingualism is concerned. In opposition to a territorial solution that confines different language usages to designated places and to those who inhabit these places, McMurtry promoted the option of a shared bilingualism as part and parcel of a shared citizenship, respectful of individual choice and reflective of the reality of increased public mobility.

McLellan (1985) argued that there is legal support for a shared bilingualism in education rights by combining provincial and federal legislation. Informed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982), McLennan (1985) also offered a legal foundation for Kymlicka's efforts at reconciling group rights within a liberal ideology based on individual rights. McLennan (1985) aimed to facilitate greater citizen participation in the Canadian liberal democracy and promote a shared sense of citizenship that includes a commitment to the value of individualism, bilingualism, and cultural pluralism.

For Abu-Laban (2007), society is based on relationships. Accordingly, diversity in society is best understood in terms of power relations. Abu-Laban (2007) maintained that the various points of intersections of these power relations in society are revealing of inequalities that have been perpetuated over time. In reply to Kymlicka (2007) then, Abu-Laban (2007) highlighted the need to better take into account the historical and present-day power relations within the multinational liberal democratic state. Therefore, to take Canada forward, united, we must be familiar with its past, including the divergent narratives that have existed. Such an approach would help to understand how these concerns echo still today and why inequality in discourses allows some narratives to

attract more attention as compared to others. According to Abu-Laban (2007), a long-view enables a better recognition and understanding of the transformations of liberal traditions that have marked Canadian society and affected how diversity has been valued and dealt with. This position confirmed the legitimacy of my own research project's design to look at the past in terms of different levels of influence, in order to make sense of the present situation.

Summary of the Fourth Section

In this section of the literature review, academic work has been presented according to key concepts important to understanding FI as more than an institutionalized natural approach to second language learning, but also as public school pedagogical innovation imbedded with liberal democratic political ideals.

The scholarship presented here aids understanding about how the 1920s were important to bilingual education in the British Empire, including here in Alberta, and how this decade provides insights in the development of FI in Alberta by framing the political context and assumptions surrounding this pedagogical approach to bilingual education. Moreover, this theoretical framework establishes the guiding principles with which to explore the FI program in relation to the rights-based discourse concerning FSOL bilingual education held by FI parents and organizations.

Conclusion

This literature review has depicted how the study of bilingualism has been dominated from a psychological standpoint concerned about cognitive development and academic achievement. This review has further demonstrated that there is an increasing interest in the socio-political ramifications of FI and bilingualism policies as these apply

to the heterogeneous public and to the concept of citizenship in a liberal democratic state. Presented as such, FI's literature can be appreciated as pieces of a work in progress across many seemingly disjointed fields. Awareness of the relationships between these fields, however, is essential to deepening our understanding as to how FI has developed in this province.

This literature review has demonstrated that in the matter of bilingualism and second language education, very little is known about what happened in the first six decades of the 20th century. Peal and Lambert (1962) discussed early studies in terms of the methodologies, but not in terms of the greater socio-political factors that helped shape these studies. The tremendously detailed and well-regarded work done in FI in Canada since the 1960s has overshadowed the previous period, before FI pedagogy had been labeled and formally established, even though similarity in thinking across the periods has been highlighted throughout this literature review. By ignoring the preamble to the official launch of the French immersion program in Canada, much useful meaning-making information has been left to collect dust in the archives. This neglected contextual information can be used to better understand FI's seemingly sudden appearance in the Canadian educational landscape, and its course of development in Alberta. In this project, then, I seek to understand FI's evolution in Alberta by taking a closer look at what was happening in the province in the 1920s, a high point for bilingualism research and second language educational policies and practices in the British Empire.

The historical and socio-political aspects of FI are explored to deepen our appreciation of the relationship between FI and public education policies, in terms of

differentiated liberal currents, evolving notions of citizenship, and the implications for language use and language education. It is with these concerns in mind that I undertake a sociopolitical history of French-English bilingual education in Alberta, with a focus in the 1920s period, to better understand the development of FI in Alberta.

Chapter 3: The Methodology

Qualitative Historical Sociological Case Study

This research is a qualitative case study within the tradition of historical sociology, and particularly that of interpretive historical sociology.

Definition of a Case Study

In sociological case studies, the attention is drawn to “the constructs of society and socialization in studying educational phenomena” (Merriam, 1998, p. 37). By this we are to understand that to develop a better understanding of an issue, we must look at the social conditions that surrounds it. For Yin (2014), the case study helps “explain some present circumstance” through the means of an “in-depth description” within “a holistic and real-world perspective” (p.4). In other words, Yin saw the case study as a way to achieve a better understanding of an issue by getting familiar with the complexities that surround it, the issue as it exists in its natural setting, and not a laboratory setting, detached from influential conditions.

Yin (2014) viewed a case study as a research method, a way to get a better understanding of an issue. Merriam (1998) agreed with Smith (1978) who spoke of a case study in terms of “a bounded system” (Smith quoted in Merriam, 1998, p. 27). In Merriam’s (1998) eyes, this idea of a central cordoned off “object of study” (p. 27) was of high importance for the case study. For Merriam (1998), “the case” was “a thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” (p. 27). Like Merriam and Smith, Yin (2014) believed in the importance of “bounding the case” (p.33). For Yin (2014) delimiting the time boundaries to be studied was especially important as these boundaries

would help guide the scope of the research and clarify the distinction that is sometimes blurred between the social phenomenon and the context.

Merriam (1998) highlighted that a qualitative case study uses a wider variety of methods as compared to a historical research on account of its emphasis on “insight, discovery and interpretation” (pp. 28-29). She described qualitative case studies as being focused on the particular and on description. Qualitative case studies are also heuristic; where a deeper understanding is sought (Merriam, 1998). As such, Merriam (1998) claimed that a case study’s strength lie in its capacity to generate concrete knowledge and contextual knowledge that allow for a better interpretation of the case at hand and a deeper understanding the process of how the case works, and who is involved.

There are many types of case studies. Merriam (1998) spoke of four according to their “disciplinary orientation” (p. 34): the ethnographic case study, the psychological case study, as well as the sociological case study and the historical case study, of which the latter two are most relevant here. The historical case study could entail descriptions of program development over time; the element of time being key (Merriam, 1998, p. 35). When historical accounts touch upon current contexts, there is an overlap between historical and case study research (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). Although Yin (2014) recognized the similarity between a historical study and a case study, he maintained that a case study was distinct on account of the case study’s emphasis on present-day unfolding events, or put another way, the degree to which there was a “focus on contemporary as opposed to entirely historical events” (p. 9). According to Yin (2014), another feature that differentiated a case study from a historical study is the possibility in a case study to

conduct interviews with people who have been involved with the issue at hand, regardless of when this involvement occurred.

Yin (2014) acknowledged that case studies, like other forms of research, might be used for explanatory, descriptive, or exploratory purposes. Merriam (1998) also identified case studies according to their intent: the evaluative case study, the descriptive case study and the one that is most interesting for this paper, the interpretive case study. Wellington (2000) recalled a variety of authors' classifications, of which two will be related here as they pertain to my case study: Bogdan and Biklen (1998).

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) classified case studies into three groups: the historical-organizational case study, the observational case study and the life history case study. This latter type aims to get an in-depth self-portrait of the participant through a heavy reliance on interviews in order to gather as much information about a lifetime as possible. In the observational case study, however, the present concerns are the priority and the past is mentioned in passing in order to situate the reader. That type of history can be limited to the reference of a few past research papers on the area of study as a means of introduction to the specific work at hand. Interviews and in-depth observation make up the bulk of this technique. Finally, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) established that the historical-organizational case study is intended to illustrate the evolution of an institution or other unit, within a time frame. Interviews and document analysis are employed but depending on the subject, the relative scarcity of these sources may make this type of case study challenging.

I had not believed that scarcity of sources could be a problem for my research project, given the many French and English language newspapers, government records

and conference proceedings from the period, in addition to the sources from the literature review. However, my experience has proven just how true Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) observation was. Between the lack of transparency in government records, the missing key issues of some newspapers, and the disinterest for the research topic in the surviving issues of many newspapers, I have been challenged throughout this project. Despite these challenges, there have also been rewarding discoveries. As such, I believe that a case study of a historical nature, as described by Bogdan and Biklen (1998), has fit well with my intent to look at a period of time and see what processes were at work in the evolution of bilingual education that allowed FI to develop in Alberta.

As will also be discussed in the next section, the main question facing case study work is that of generalizability. Yin (2014) asserted that case studies offer generalizations that apply to the theory used, as opposed to the direct application to other populations. In this sense, case studies are sources of findings, not deemed to be true for all situations *per se*, but that can be potentially explained by a theory and therefore have indirect universal implications. It is in this sense that I understand Yin's (2014) claim that "a case study, like the experiment, does not represent a 'sample', and in doing case-study research, your goal will be to expand and generalize theories (analytical generalizations) and not to extrapolate probabilities (statistical generalizations)" (p. 21). However, this places an emphasis on the commonalities between cases and such an emphasis is not always deemed to be the goal of a case study, according to other researchers. Wellington (2000) argued that the case study is an engaging format, both for the researcher and the reader of the case study work, on account that it allows a narrative writing style that provides detailed and nuanced insights, and these contribute (directly or indirectly) to the

understanding of a given issue. The flexibility in writing style and the emphasis on bringing about something of interest, regardless of how its related to the subject at hand, fitted well with my research approach. With regards to case study work in historical sociology, Skocpol's (1984) position is similar to that of Wellington. Skocpol (1984) recognized Yin's position but also allowed case studies to be focused on the particularities, depending on the type of historical sociological research.

Definition of Historical Sociology

Historical sociology has an interdisciplinary character. McCulloch and Richardson (2000) defined it as "a branch of sociology mainly concerned with exploring social theories over time" (p. 130). It is a space where history and the social sciences meet, rather than collide.

Historical sociology, notably comparative historical sociology, which will be discussed next, has been defined as "a sociology that relies explicitly on the past to explain and understand the origins, auspices, and arrangements of social structures, institutions, and processes" (Wood & Williamson, 2007, p. 118). Harrison (2004) highlighted the "explicitly theoretical" (p. 147) nature of historical sociology when compared to social history.

Theda Skocpol has written about historical sociology as an approach to research. Skocpol (1984) defined historical sociology as "an ongoing tradition of research into the nature and effects of large-scale structures and long-term processes of change" (p. 359). In Skocpol's view, historical sociologies may explore something, someone, or some time in history as easily as it may track a transformative evolution over time from the past to the present (Skocpol, 1984, p. 360) but the focus remains on "the *particular* and *varying*

features of special kinds of ... change” (Harrison, 2004, pp. 146-147). Accordingly, in Skocpol’s (1984) view, historical sociology is a flexible approach, apt to pursue research in a variety of paradigms.

Likewise, the methods and sources employed in historical sociology are varied, making use of primary and secondary sources, qualitative and quantitative methods. Moreover, historical sociology lends itself to single or multiple case studies over long periods of time. Wood and Williamson (2007, pp. 120-121) explicitly allowed decades, even centuries. Therefore, the outlook may be somewhat narrow, but far-reaching. No matter the number of cases in a historical sociological study, however, even in the situation of a single case study like my project, “the writing of history” is not an end in itself, but a means to be used in the pursuit of understanding a phenomenon over time (Wood & Williamson, 2007, p. 120). History contains the contextual clues contributing to the phenomenon’s transformation and it is up to the researcher to dig deeply. As a result, Skocpol (1984), and Wood and Williamson (2007) agree: on account of the depth and breadth of knowledge that is required to fully explore the conditions that make up any one case, the number of cases under evaluation are usually limited. As such, a single case study as in my project, has worked well as a historical sociological study.

Historical sociology is a mixed bag of approaches. Skocpol (1984) distinguished three currents of research strategies in historical sociology: one based on models and their application to explain the subject matter; one centered on causal analysis to explain historical regularities or irregularities; and one focused on meaningful interpretation of the subject matter through the use of concepts. For their part, Wood and Williamson (2007) remind us of Tilly’s (1984) categorizations: world-historical approaches, world-

systems theory, macro-historical approaches and micro-historical approach. These seem to be variations similar to Skocpol's (1984) model based and causal analysis historical sociologies. On the other hand, Curtis (2012) speaks of a reflexive historical sociology that resembles a mixture of what Skocpol (1984) had identified as causal analysis historical sociology and interpretive historical sociology. These examples suffice to demonstrate the flexibility inherent to historical sociology and its adaptability to different research endeavors. For the purpose of my study, I chose to adopt what Skocpol (1984) referred to as interpretive historical sociology.

Definition of Interpretive Historical Sociology (IHS)

Skocpol (1984) explained that researchers engaging in interpretive historical sociology (IHS) are less interested in universal models or generalizable causal links in studying past occurrences and their relation to the present. Rather, they prefer to espouse the particularities of the situation and seek to deepen their understanding of how the combination of factors contributed to the situation (Skocpol, 1984).

To this end, research in IHS tends to include general concepts that are identified and explored within the boundaries of the study. These concepts serve as conducting threads. Skocpol (1984) informed us that such guiding concepts help in the clarification of the subject at hand. They also assist in bringing to the forefront those relevant themes or patterns of the case study or case studies (Skocpol, 1984). In my project, the following concepts facilitated the study of FI development in Alberta: liberalism, bilingual education, and citizenship. Together, these concepts have provided the structure required to keep the research manageable, productive, and on track.

IHS utilizes theoretical frameworks to help order the findings and shape insights. Unlike grand theorization, theoretical frameworks do not generalize from the case study but rather, bring a certain perspective to view the case. Whereas historical research is not known for including theoretical frameworks, IHS is. Skocpol (1984) explained that IHS encourages a juxtaposition of elements of the historical tradition with those of the social sciences' tradition. IHS became, then, a useful option to do a type of history of education project with the assistance of a social theory lens, as in this study of bilingual education in Alberta.

If IHS makes use of guiding concepts and is conducive to the use of theoretical lens, it is on account of the emphasis on meaning. IHS aims to deepen the understanding of the subject, either as an alternative to another position, or as a straightforward proposition of an historically-based interpretation of a social process. The latter option applied to my research project.

Skocpol (1984) emphasized that within IHS, the meaning is paramount. When developing this deeper meaning, researchers using this approach must consider the “culturally imbedded intentions” (p. 368) of the participants involved. In this case, I have needed to consider the ‘culturally imbedded intentions’ of policymakers, school inspectors, and teachers as well as parents, whenever possible. Presumably, it is recognized here that the intentions can only be imperfectly known by the researcher, on account of, for example, the distance in time separating the researcher from her subject, possible language barriers, accidental or intentional misrepresentations by/in the source, etc. The importance of the context or “the historical settings” (Skocpol, 1984, p. 368) becomes key to gleaming any sense of the participants’ intentions. This emphasis on

endeavoring to become aware of the intentions was relevant for my work as my topic hinged on meaning making and considered a host of diverse intentions of those involved.

Moreover, Skocpol (1984) advised that in developing a meaning within IHS, it is critical to consider how the subject at hand—including what has been said about it over time—is relevant and important to the present. Skocpol (1984) was referring to the present public, stressing the importance of establishing how the chosen topic that is associated with the past, can relate to current political and cultural considerations.

Skocpol (1984) further clarified that IHS research is designated for a wider target population than solely the “specialized academic audiences” (p. 368). Therefore, when evaluating the significance of something in an interpretive historical sociological study, the researcher must remember that her public is broad and diverse. As I intend for this project to reach a readership within and outside of academia, IHS is a fitting strategy for my purposes.

In sum, good IHS research according to Skocpol (1984) is characterized by guiding concepts and theoretical frameworks in order to meaningfully reconcile today’s preoccupations with yesterday’s occurrences.

The Critiques of an IHS Single Case Study

Generalizations are a problem with single case studies, especially in the situation of a single case study focused on the specific characteristics of its topic of investigation, such as my project. As this research is only intended to apply to the Alberta context, it is not suitable to make generalizations from this situation. Moreover, the question of clarity may be problematic in an IHS single case study because, as Skocpol (1984) points out, the burden of contrasting lies on the shoulders of the reader. However, I believe that such

a burden is off-set by the nuanced literature review, where multiple and contrasting perspectives are made available to the reader.

The Rationale for an Interpretive Historical Sociology Single Case Study

French immersion (FI) education is a vast topic and there exists a panoply of repeated primary source FI research. In Canada, FI is often associated with the federal government and the province of Québec. Framing my study of bilingual French-English education as an IHS case study has allowed me to situate it within a particular Anglo-dominant provincial setting and period that has yielded contextualized insights and a better understanding of bilingual education development outside Central Canada. Alberta was a new burgeoning liberal democratic state in the early 20th century, within a dominion, when the British Empire was itself changing. This province was further characterized by a highly multicultural, and multilingual population, including a longstanding and firmly established French-speaking population that was particularly active in the field of education. In addition, this provincial society within a British dominion was evolving at the same time as bilingual research was making strides and impacting second language education views and policy in Great Britain, particularly in the 1920s. This coincidence is especially noteworthy, given that Alberta's first premier, who was also the Minister of Education, had a very keen interest in all matters related to education and established a lasting legacy of excellence and innovation in the field. With such a unique historical setting at my fingertips, in addition to the situation of French language education in this province, an Alberta-based IHS study on French-English bilingual education had potential to provide many rich insights in FI's development.

A single case study offered a good balance between manageability of process and probability of uncovering important insights. Moreover, as an established research approach, IHS enabled me to grapple with an education issue within the long view offered by history and using the lens of a theoretical framework.

Criteria for my Research

The aim of this project is to come to a better understanding of the historical and current French immersion situation in Alberta. Guba and Lincoln (1989) have proposed a set of criteria that is not so much a mirror of the criteria used within a positivist worldview, as much as it is an equitable method of establishing the rigor of qualitative research. Like Schwandt (2007), I feel that Guba and Lincoln's criteria for trustworthiness and authenticity complement each other and promote legitimate and justifiable interpretations.¹¹

In brief, Guba and Lincoln (1989) sought to establish the trustworthiness and authenticity of interpretive research, as opposed to its validity because validity rests on the criteria from the positivist paradigm. Accordingly, qualitative research may be deemed trustworthy when it answers the following criteria: credibility in lieu of internal validity; transferability rather than external validity or generalizability; dependability instead of reliability; and confirmability as a replacement for objectivity (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). The authenticity of the work is recognized if the project responds to another set of criteria: fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity, and tactical authenticity.

¹¹ Schwandt (2007) spoke of Guba and Lincoln (1989) and some of their earlier work collectively. I refer to Guba and Lincoln (1989) in particular.

Trustworthiness Criteria

Credibility involves coherence between the interpretations by the research-participants of their realities, and the interpretation of the researcher of those realities. As I have worked with documents, trustworthiness was dependent on peer debriefing, journaling, and fact checking via triangulation of sources. In the absence of participants, it was useful to discuss my research with colleagues, when possible, and to make a record of my expectations and interpretations before and during the process in order to track the changes that take place in my understanding—what Guba and Lincoln (1989) referred to as ‘progressive subjectivity’.

For Guba and Lincoln (1989), transferability is heavily dependent on rich descriptions. As the researcher, I have had to give as much detail as possible in order for the reader to be able to judge to what extent the findings in my project might be similar to those of other cases. Over time, the conditions that allow (or not) for transferability may vary, so rich descriptions were important.

Guba and Lincoln (1989) argued that dependability embraces change in research design because these changes reflect emergent understanding, signaling a difference in the researcher’s posture at the end of the process. This change must be explicitly recorded at every stage as such transparency will facilitate its tracking.

Confirmability, according to Guba and Lincoln (1989), rests on the way data integrity is assured. Confirmability is achieved by enabling the reader to retrace and understand the researcher’s steps in order to verify that this interpretation is logical, given the information, its sources, and the circumstances.

For Guba and Lincoln (1989), both confirmability and dependability require audits in order to be achieved. Whereas the former must enable accountability of the information and the sources, the latter must footnote any and all changes that occurred throughout the inquiry. These audits allow the reader to make judgments about the quality of the research project. In my historical research project, confirmability and dependability have been important to safeguard the trustworthiness of my work.

Trustworthiness of the work is not enough, however, to ensure the goodness of qualitative research; authenticity is also required. As aforementioned, authenticity relies on another set of criteria.

Authenticity Criteria

Fairness as a criterion for quality control in a qualitative research project encapsulates the researcher's duty to acknowledge all possibilities, including those that are contradictory. The various interpretations, along with their foundational values, must be thoroughly explained, as must also be the reasons for conflict between them. Moreover, Guba and Lincoln (1989) further emphasized the evenhanded and consultative nature of any such presentation by the researcher. In the case of my document analysis, it was crucial to respect what seemed to be the intended message of the document, to understand what was emphasized, while also uncovering what was left out. There is the importance of making use of divergent sources, journaling, and peer debriefing.

Other criteria discussed in Guba and Lincoln (1989), and also discussed in Guba and Lincoln (1994) as well as in Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba (2011), are ontological authenticity and educative authenticity, in addition to catalytic authenticity and tactical authenticity. These criteria are very much participant-oriented and given the nature of my

document-based inquiry, they did not formally apply to my project. However, as the next section will explain, my document analysis was shaped by other measures to ensure its legitimacy.

Method

The role of documents in educational research is not as prominent as it once was (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000). Documents seem to have become the reserve of historians, whereas social scientists have tended to prefer questionnaires, interviews, and observational situations (McCulloch, 2004). Yet, the use of documents in an education research project seems most fitting as they provide an excellent portal to glean different views into the past, “in an effort to offer an ever-new past to the present” (Brundage, 2008, p. 3). Not only do documents allow a better understanding of what has come before, they are building blocks that help formulate our understanding of the present. Although documents have long played ‘second fiddle’ to interviews in qualitative research, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) claimed that documents are becoming more and more substantial in their importance and recognized as a “primary source of data” (p. 57).

Document Analysis

According to Wellington (2000), document analysis in educational research is how we go about finding meaning from a text and its relevancy to the topic under study. It is the various “strategies and procedures for analyzing and interpreting the documents of any kind important for the study of a particular area” (Wellington, 2000, p. 196). McCulloch (2004) observed an absence of works promoting documentary studies and their relevance in the social sciences, in education and in history, despite the fact that documents abound everywhere. Like Wellington, McCulloch (2004) recognized the

importance of coming to understand a document in its context, as well as in relation to its author and in relation to the intents of the document's production.

Primary and Secondary Sources

To be able to understand a document in relation to the subject and to its context, it is helpful to identify the source type. Brundage (2008) identified two types of written primary sources: the manuscript (anything handwritten or typed with limited copies) and the published work (many copies). Secondary sources are discussed in terms of forms (i.e. monographs/books, articles, essays), tone and intent, for example. These are works that have used the primary sources and moved past them, transforming the initial information like gasoline is refined from crude oil. "The written histories that historians fashion from these (primary) sources in turn become (secondary) sources for subsequent investigators" (Brundage, 2008, p. 19).

Wellington (2000) identified any preexisting document as a secondary source for the purposes of a document analysis in educational research. McCulloch and Richardson (2000) defined primary sources as "first-hand accounts" and secondary sources as "accounts and interpretations of historical events or long-term processes" (pp. 79-80). According to the standards set by the 19th century German school of historical writing, and Leopold van Ranke, a primary source is something authored by an eyewitness to, or a participant in, the event. As such, diaries, letters and such documents would be viewed as primary sources. In the 20th century, many historians such as Arthur Marwick have respected this distinction between primary and secondary sources. In Marwick's (1970/1989) words:

The primary source is the raw material, more meaningful to the expert historian than to the reader; the secondary source is the coherent work of history, article, dissertation or book, in which both the intelligent general reader and the historian who is venturing upon a new research topic, or keeping in touch with new discoveries in his chosen field, or seeking to widen his general historical knowledge will look for what they want. (p. 202)

Moreover, among sources, there seems to exist a hierarchy. Rahikainen and Fellman (2012) have spoken of contemporary evidence as embodying some sort of “moral priority” (p. 25), regardless of whether or not it is viewed as a primary or secondary source. For Marwick (1970/1989), it would appear that there is an old principle at work among some historians that confers greater respectability to handwritten documents over printed sources. Marwick dismissed this distinction. In Marwick’s view, what makes a primary source valuable is the manner in which it is relevant to the subject at hand. As such, Marwick considered many sources of information as potential primary sources and he affirmed that document categorization is context-dependent.

Like Marwick (1970/1989), Brundage (2008) also refuted the primacy of the handwritten document that would make it the first among primary sources. Brundage’s emphasis on published primary sources seems to be a reflection of ease of access. This implicitly acknowledges a value exclusive to published primary sources. Indeed, the profusion of information made available through changing technologies increasingly complicates how many ways a document can be perceived, accessed, and used.

McCulloch (2004) asserted that the once unquestioned distinction between primary and secondary sources is increasingly difficult to accept because the source’s

designation depends on how it is employed. Therefore, the research question must not only give a direction to the research, but a sense of how to use different sources.

Rahikainen and Fellman (2012) acknowledged the dilemma of a traditional fixed definition in contrast with changing research needs. Whereas they maintained that primary and secondary sources were distinct, they asserted that the nature of the source cannot be known beforehand (Rahikainen & Fellman, 2012). Therefore, whether it is a secondary or primary source becomes clearer once the researcher has become familiar with it and decides how to use it.

As such, my primary sources were a mix of published and unpublished documents: association newsletters, media coverage, federal and provincial legislation, commissions' and organizations' reports, as well as letters, scrapbooks, telegrams, period manuscripts and conference discussion notes and related information. My secondary sources were a similar mix of published and unpublished sources. These included conference papers, unpublished dissertations, articles, and books, including companions and dictionaries. In addition to the University of Alberta library system, I conducted archival fieldwork at the Glenbow Museum Archives in Calgary, as well as University of Alberta Libraries and Archives, the Provincial Archives of Alberta and the Legislature Library in Edmonton. I also sought assistance from the TES in London, England in order to locate and review documents for my research.

Archives

Archived material composed part of my data collection. I was aware that this would create some challenges. Howell and Prevenier (2001) cautioned that not all sources inform research in a straightforward way. In addition to the recognition of

sources as primary or secondary, these authors offered a breakdown of the sources by typology (direct/indirect; relics/testimonials; narrative/literary/diplomatic/social documents etc.). In this case, qualifying the sources was important. Given the complexity of sources, it was important to know how to locate potential sources and correctly identify the sources.

Location of Source

The public and private collections of archives are awe-inspiring and potentially overwhelming. Therefore, the need to limit the search is very real, in order to keep the research manageable. As such, the first step in approaching the archival aspect of this research required me to start with something: topics, names, or sequence of events, for example. With such ‘hooks’, I was hopeful to latch onto something useful: something that would allow me to engage with the archival system and lead me to more information that could inform my study. This approach is supported by King (2012), for whom “identifying one relevant archival document often leads back to a string of others, embedded as they were into existing bureaucratic paper trails at the moment of their creation” (p. 22).

However, whether searching subject headings in the old fashioned card index cabinets, or perusing the lists online, or even when set to rummage through a trolley full of boxes brought out from the back room, it is important to have a clear idea as to what it is that is being researched in order to make choices more effectively. Yet, one’s intention should not be so specific as to elicit a form of tunnel vision. It is necessary to establish the object of the research, while remaining open to different possible avenues that are related and that might inform the study. “Answers in the archives—in the form of

documents—always abound; the real difficulty lies in figuring out what questions to ask of them” (King, 2012, p. 20). King (2012) coined the term “archival matrix” (p. 21) to speak of the importance of being conscious of what has been written as well as well as how it has been recorded. Awareness of this duality helps make meaning of the mounds of information that have been archived and allows the researcher to make informed choices regarding the leads to follow.

In my approach to seek a deeper understanding of bilingual education and FI as FSOL education in Alberta, my focus was on the 1920s surrounding the Welsh Studies and the Imperial Education Conference of 1923 as seen through the lens of Kymlicka’s two principles. The years leading up to studied period helped contextualize the events and the mindset of the 1920s. As such, the 1920s decade can be understood as a time of great activity in bilingualism research and language education policymaking in Britain and across its empire. For the purposes of this research, the interest lies primarily on the motivations and discussions about bilingualism in education that may have been manifest in the geopolitically removed and burgeoning province of Alberta. As Alberta was the authority in its own educational matters within a dominion, while also engaged in a direct relationship with Great Britain through its Agent-General posted on London, through its participation in a number of IECs, through its strong presence in the Khaki University project and its avant-gardist university faculty, it was anticipated that British ideas would have found their way into Alberta, perhaps influencing provincial educational language policies and practices.

Moreover, I have looked at this time frame from a few different angles: within the context of internal operations of the province, where the provincial government and the

Department of Education dealt with local issues; and in the context of external operations of the province, where the government of Alberta and its representatives promoted Alberta's interests in Great Britain, while keeping abreast of current news and prevailing trends. As such, I have looked for material about: other imperial conferences; other imperial education conferences; other related conferences on bilingual education; standing provincial representation in London, England; and evidence of provincial awareness of British educational views, such as might be found in Department of Education reports, just to name some trails of investigation. To assist my search the Provincial Archives of Alberta, I was given a form that helped make explicit the question(s), in relation to the sources that I have consulted, and what they yielded. The located leads have provided insights that have added to the depth of understanding of FI's development in the province, in relation to the events of the 1920s.

Identification of Material.

Generally speaking, the material located in the archives has been identified according to the APA rules by following its general format while allowing for flexibility when circumstances dictate, and providing as much information as possible in order to allow the reader to retrieve the artifact, if needed.

I visited the Glenbow Museum Archives in Calgary, Alberta, online and in person, as well as the University of Alberta Archives and its Peel Prairie Provinces collection. I have also made many visits to the Provincial Archives of Alberta in Edmonton. When institutional policy has allowed it, I have photographed the artifacts in order to have the best possible visual evidence for reference. Otherwise, screen shots saved to a USB key or photocopies have been made of the evidence for referential

purposes and I have taken handwritten notes. At the Provincial Archives, these photocopies were ordered and identified by the dossier's title, the accession number as well as by the file/item number, and the page number of the dossier. As Howell and Prevernier (2001) have asserted, establishing the provenance of the archived material is fundamental for its potential usefulness and provides the basis for its classification within the archives.

When locating sources, it is helpful to have as many details as possible, in addition to the essential indication of origin. I have noticed that even when sources are listed on-line, it can be useful to see the artifacts in person as the listing may be organized according to a thematic grouping (e.g., invitations) that covers multiple years and occasions, over many pages, without further identifying the exact sought-for item. This has been my experience when dealing with family papers that have been donated to an institution. Therefore, a printout copy of the online listing to which one can add more specific information by hand was highly beneficial. This is what I have done in the case of the photos I took of the scrapbook clippings of Mabel Reid, née Laurie. Of no relation to S. S. Laurie, she was married to John A. Reid, second Agent-General of Alberta, and collected many artifacts related to her husband's tenure and their posting in England. In addition, a record of the place and time of the visit, online or in person, is a good idea. In particular, it may help retrieve the item again at a future date, even if changes have been in the way the item had been catalogued: either temporarily, such as if the studied file has been placed in the hold section for a researcher to continue her perusal at a later date; or more permanently, such as when an item that is no longer relevant in its original function, is finally chosen to be transferred to another institution, such as an archive. This latter

point is mentioned in Howell and Prevenier's (2001) discussion about the importance of identifying sources.

The library system may hold treasure troves of information, but in the case of historical research, library holdings may be supplemented by archived collections. Having found in Sissons (1917, pp. 200, 201) a reference to a representative of the province of Québec who attended and spoke at the 1911 Imperial Education Conference, I made inquiries about whether or not Alberta had representation at the same conference. As a result, I found a reference in Rusak (1966) that Premier Rutherford, Alberta's first premier and Minister of Education, had been absent from office in 1907 in order to attend the "London Conference on Education" (p. 34) where, among other things, the role of uniform textbooks in Britain and throughout the Empire had been discussed.

These threads helped focus my work in the archives. I have found that the province did have official representation in London: an Agent-General of Alberta. According to an official Order-In-Council letter of 1913, as well as by a stamped official copy of a passage in the minutes of the Executive Council of Alberta of 1913, this seems to have been a position that entailed a five-year appointment in London, England, by the provincial government. From the correspondence between the provincial government and the Agent-General in 1928, I learned that this position entailed the duties of a liaison person between Albertan and English society and government.

At the Provincial Archives of Alberta, within the correspondence of 1928 between the provincial government and Agent-General Greenfield (Accession #70.414, item # 1085) there is no mention of the Imperial Education Conferences, although the proceedings of the larger Imperial Conference of 1926 were found in the dossier (Item

#1086). This conference was not one on Education; rather, it was part of a series of conferences between the late 19th century and the mid 20th century, held twice in Ottawa, Canada, when not in London, England, and where heads of state of the British Empire assembled and discussed mainly trade, travel, and citizenship issues. In the proceedings of these conferences, obtained at an earlier date through the library system, I had found no evidence of provincial representation, or anything associated with language policy and practice in education. The discovery of a copy of the proceedings of 1926 edition of this conference in the government dossier pertaining to correspondence between the province and its Agent-General represented an enigma. The proceedings of the Imperial Education Conferences as well as related newspaper articles did not mention Alberta's Agent-General but provided countless other insights for this research.

I have also consulted the Glenbow Museum's archived collection of Jessie DeGear, a relation of Mabel Reid, née Laurie. The Jessie DeGear foundation, composed of the DeGear and Laurie family papers that have been indexed by numbered series, catalogued in boxes, and further identified by numbered scrapbooks, each with a descriptive table of contents, listing the thematically grouped items with the corresponding year(s). These many reference points were important as I found that the page numbers did not always reflect a chronological sequence of events or the linear passage of time. Often, the page numbers were in order but the information on these pages was a mix of different events, in different places and times. Therefore, if the table of contents listed events A, B, and C between 1900 and 1930, for example, the early pages did not necessarily correspond only to the first years in range: the other reference points were incredibly useful to better pinpoint and confirm the desired item.

Alternatively, many scrapbooks have the same page number, thereby necessitating additional information to know which is the correct one.

Mabel Laurie, sister of Jessie De Gear and wife of Alberta's Agent-General, John Alexander Reid, dutifully made scrapbooks that have survived over time, and that are today part of the Glenbow Museum's Archives. Of particular interest, I have found in Series Two, Box M-314-22, Scrapbook One, pp. 28-29, the official letter and the stamped copy of Reid's nomination for a five-year term appointment as Agent-General of Alberta in London, England. The letter was dated 1913 and the Reids were stationed in London, representing Alberta until 1918. During that time, they received many invitations to formal events, many of which are to be found in the same series, box and scrapbook as the instatement letter. Among these invitations, I found one to attend the third annual meeting of the Teachers' Associations of the British Empire (p. 40) and reception (p. 131), in July 1915. This data is important as it indicates that the province of Alberta had official and direct access to people and information in London, England, pertaining to the field of education, between 1913 and 1918. It is noteworthy that the Order-In-Council, written on government paper with letterhead, and the official stamped copy of the passage from the minutes of the Executive Council of Alberta were found within these family papers in the Glenbow Museum Archives, as opposed to the government documentation in the Provincial Archives of Alberta. These findings illustrate the importance of exploring multiple avenues of potential sources in order to retrieve some parcels of relevant information.

In fact, my visits to the Provincial Archives of Alberta did not turn up any papers from the time of John A. Reid's appointment. However, while looking for such evidence

in the Provincial Secretary's papers upon the archivist's suggestion, I have come across many Department of Education reports complete with the reports of individual school inspectors and an example of a grade 11 and grade 12 examination where some of Professor S. S. Laurie's views on second language education were directly referenced and the students had been asked to explain them. On account of this surprising find, I have spent much time looking over Department of Education reports at the Provincial Archives of Alberta and Coutts Library at the University of Alberta.

This depiction of my work above represents how I have used the archives in my research. The archives represent a unique reservoir of knowledge of official and personal information to be used together and in conjunction with other material (e.g., library holdings) as each source may shed light on different facets of the same subject and help provide a more complete picture of the problem. It is important to keep an open mind and yet have a clear idea as to the research focus when accessing the archives, in order to make efficient choices that keep the study manageable. The importance of this becomes more evident when the research takes much longer than anticipated. Attention must be paid when trying to locate the information on the object of study, as well as when identifying it. Regardless of where the documentation derives from, however, care in its interpretation remains a cornerstone of any good research.

Document Appraisal and Analysis

Documents cannot be simply taken at face value but should be viewed critically by learning about the authors and about other similar works in order to compare accounts and get a grasp on the subject and how it has been interpreted (Brundage, 2008).

Brundage (2008) considered primary as well as secondary sources according to whether or not something was meant to be published from the outset, or whether it was published as an afterthought. In addition, something recorded in the heat of the moment and the same thing recalled at a later date may be valued differently. As Brundage (2008) pointed out, the timing of the recording can help or hinder the recollection of events and participants, just as the motivation to make the recording may be to frame an event or a person in a particular light. It is not at all surprising then, that a primary source's value is intrinsic to its temporal distance from the event.

Wellington (2007) added that a document has multiple meanings, the interpretive and the literal, and in order to grasp these meanings, the researcher must make use of the hermeneutical approach. A cursory reading will provide a grammatical orientation of the text, its "denotation" (p. 116); additional readings of this literal meaning within a hermeneutical mindset is vital to get a sense of the "connotation" (p. 116) required to formulate an interpretation. Wellington (2000) listed seven points that create the hermeneutical process "to be used as a framework for exploring and analyzing documents of any kind," being the context, authorship, intended audiences, intentions and purposes, vested interests, genre, style and tone, and presentation and appearance (p. 116).

McCulloch (2004) also emphasized the need for a rigorous procedure to follow when analyzing a document by following a checklist that addresses the document's authenticity, reliability, meaning as well as theorization. Like Wellington (2000), McCulloch (2004) demanded the need to verify the document's authorship and conditions production. Parallel to Guba and Lincoln (1989), McCulloch (2004) highlighted the importance of establishing trustworthiness of the source. To this end, he

recognized the importance of bias identification, including attention to the reasons why some sources survive while others don't, or were not intended to (McCulloch, 2004). These points join Wellington's (2000) criterion of intentions, purposes, and vested interests. For McCulloch (2004), it isn't enough to comprehend the purpose of the document, the researcher must also get a grasp of the context that shaped it; only then is understanding the meaning of the source possible. In this attempt, McCulloch (2004) referenced Fairclough's (1995) "social semiotic approach" (p. 45) that views the wording of a document as a form of social engagement. As such, there is attention to detail with regards to the presentation of the text: its organization and the language that was used, what was included as well as what was omitted. Again, there is a level of congruence with Wellington's (2000) framework.

However, for McCulloch (2004) there is also the necessity to view the document through a theoretical framework. McCulloch and Richardson (2000) had previously argued that documentary analysis involves both theoretical underpinnings as well as critical readings of the sources in order to effectively address the issue of inquiry. McCulloch (2004) acknowledged three frameworks that would coincide with what Guba (1990) or Denzin and Lincoln (1994) have termed paradigms: the positivist, the critical and the interpretive paradigm. For McCulloch (2004) then, documentary analysis is a multifaceted process. It seeks to view the past through different angles in order to better understand the present. Therefore, document analysis lends itself to my project very well as a means to piece together and build up a new understanding of French Immersion in Alberta.

Given that the document's position may change over time, and that a document's meaning is plural, McCulloch (2004), and Wellington (2000) provided guidance in document-based educational research. For my project, I have followed McCulloch's (2004) checklist, as I found it best suited the nature of my IHS endeavor.

An interpretive historical sociology of the evolution of French Immersion in Alberta, focused in the 1920s and within a framework comprised of Kymlicka's two principles, provides useful insights of the past in order to help better understand the present. This approach highlights the socio-political complexities surrounding FI in Alberta. It provides a novel angle through which to view the development of this style of public education in this province. It further reflects how French as a second language education, and FI in particular, has been perceived and practiced. The acquired insights become even more meaningful when informed by the concepts of liberalism, citizenship, and rights and framed in a political theory.

The Rationale for Multicultural Citizenship as Theoretical Framework

The influence of Pierre Bourdieu's theory of social reproduction has been noted in other works concerning FI (e.g., Burns & Olson, 1983, 1989; Lamarre, 1996; Safty, 1988, 1992), both in terms of identifying the traditional French immersion student and parent profiles, as well as in terms of characterizing the relationships among FI teachers and monolingual or unilingual peers and superiors. Will Kymlicka's theory of multicultural citizenship, and Manzer's identification of liberal epochs, however, present different yet equally rich possibilities for new insights on the subject of bilingual education such as French Immersion, especially in terms of a public education program developing within a context rife in left and right wing, liberal democratic tensions as the situation in Alberta

might be described. Kymlicka's two-point framework offers a logical explanation of the important distinctions between groups in multination liberal democracies and how, together with citizenship education and the principle of distributive justice, these understandings are key to socio-political and economic stability in such states. Informed by Kymlicka's and other scholars' work, I hoped to gain a better appreciation of how different forms of liberalism in the province, as well as imperial views of social harmony may have influenced the perception and the development of French-English bilingual public education in Alberta. In so doing, I also hoped to explore the emerging mainstream space where the language of the national minority is taken up by students of the majority and what that might mean for political debate.

Time Frame, Periods, and Contexts to be Studied

The focal reference point-in-time is the 1920s, in order to see how this decade of bilingualism research and policy might be influential in French-English bilingual education in Alberta and the advent of FI in this province. This examination of French-English bilingual education is located in Alberta, as an emergent province in the Dominion of Canada and part of the British Empire under transition (to the format of the Commonwealth of Nations).

The developments in bilingual education in Alberta are reviewed within an historical and political context that will include the emergence and development of this provincial state in relation to the evolution of the Canadian federation and the changing role of the British Crown in Canadian affairs in the early 20th century. The progressive modifications of educational policy concerning bilingualism in South Africa, the UK and in Ontario are of particular interest in order to contextualize Alberta's own attempts to

deal with this issue, given the presence of French-speaking communities in an English-speaking province.

Finally, any study of bilingual education in Canada could not be complete without due consideration of the academic research and how its changing claims were reflected in or encouraged by education policies and practices in Alberta. Therefore, this project looks at Alberta in its early years as a province, with particular emphasis on the 1920s, in order to understand how past assumptions, research, and policies at the provincial, national and supra-national level interconnected with, and influenced, French-English bilingual education in Alberta. This has enabled a better appreciation of how bilingual education, and FI in particular, has developed the way it has in this province.

Purpose of Chosen Methodology, Method, and Theoretical Framework

The aim of this project is to deepen the understanding of how FI as FSOL education has evolved in Alberta by shining a light on a lesser-known period of great activity in bilingual education research and policymaking. As such, it is important to take into account the history of French language education in this province, as well as the multiple political contexts. In order to maintain consistency throughout the project, documentary analysis has been used. Given the multitude of works devoted to FI in Canada, documentary analysis represents a rich format in which to pursue my qualitative research endeavor. Moreover, the depth of scholarship by Kymlicka, Manzer, and other scholars concerning liberalism, citizenship and rights, offers a novel way to approach this research project.

Conclusion

My research methodology is based on documentary analysis, in alignment with the principles of interpretive historical sociology. My long view approach to understanding FI education in Alberta is informed by the works of Kymlicka and other scholars regarding the concepts of liberalism, citizenship and rights. Authenticity and trustworthiness of the research and employed sources will be a priority in this work. The strategies proposed by Guba and Lincoln (1989), as well as McCulloch (2004) will be essential to support this aim. The period of the 1920s, rich in activity surrounding bilingual education, provides insights into the present discussion surrounding the right to French as a second language education.

Chapter 4: The Educational and Political Context in the Northwest Territories/Alberta at the Turn of the 20th Century

Bilingual education in Alberta didn't suddenly appear in 1976 when the use of French as the language of instruction for a maximum of 80% of the day in grades three to twelve became sanctioned in provincial regulations. Leading up to that point was over a century of nation-building policies that bears witness to the clash of mentalities between two schools of thought: the one in support of unilingual or monolingual education, and the one in support of bilingual education. Although a decisive victory in favour of bilingual education was achieved in the heart of the British Empire in 1923, it took half a century for the court of public opinion to accept it fully in Alberta. How did this delay occur in a burgeoning province of staunch imperial loyalty? To understand the evolution of bilingual education in Alberta requires more than a look at the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Canada in 1963-1969, or the 1965-1969 St. Lambert Experiment of French Immersion in Québec. To understand bilingual education in Alberta today we must go back to the beginning of the end of bilingualism in the Northwest Territories in the late 19th century. We must become familiar with the people, the laws, and the ideologues that shaped education in the formative years of society in the Prairies. Only then can we begin to understand what represented the momentous agreement among representatives of the British Empire in 1923 at the Imperial Education Conference, and how that compared with bilingual education in Alberta.

Bilingualism in Government and Schools of the Northwest Territories, 1800s-1905

Prior to 1905, when it became a province of the dominion of Canada within the British Empire, Alberta was part of Canada's vast Northwest Territories (NWT). Under federal jurisdiction, the governance of the Northwest Territories was rooted in the British North American Act (1867). This has a particular importance in terms of the status and use of French in government and in education, especially given the linguistic composition of the Prairie population. In the 19th century, French was the first European language used in what is now Alberta and the French-speaking peoples, Métis and French Canadians, represented a large portion of the total population of European descent. As most French-speakers were Roman Catholic, there was also a strong presence of the Catholic Church in the Northwest Territories (Rusak, 1966).

Throughout the 19th century, Catholic religious orders established a great number of schools in the region. As most of them were French speaking, French became part of the Catholic school culture in the Northwest Territories. The first regularly operational school, École St. Joachim School, was established in Fort Edmonton in 1862 by Father Albert Lacombe of the Congregation of Oblates of Mary Immaculate (O.M.I.); one of their own, Brother Scollen, was the teacher (Heritage Community Foundation, 2009, p.1; Levasseur-Ouimet, 2003; Sparby, 1958). Levasseur-Ouimet (2003, p. 31) found that English as well as French and Catechism and were taught, to the Scottish, English, French and Métis children of Hudson Bay employees who made up the student body. This tradition combining French language instruction and Catholic education would continue into the 20th century, despite constraints. Berger (1970/2013, p. 232) concluded that the "sense of patriotism which centered upon the exaltation of Catholicism could not

but find dangerous and disquieting a sense of patriotism which was rooted in the Protestant mission”. The latter form of patriotism as carrier of the English language and Loyalist aspirations from Ontario would have a disquieting impact on western bilingualism.

In addition to schools, French and English bilingualism was also part of early government. The Northwest Territories Act (1875), passed by the federal government, reaffirmed the right to Catholic education. In 1877, the Act was amended in order to specifically guarantee the equality of the English and French languages by officially recognizing the right to use French in the courts and in government. These actions formally upheld the established bilingual character of western Canada (Aunger, 1998; Denis, 2006). Aunger (1998) has explained how successive lieutenant governors between 1870 and 1881 had ensured that the English and French languages were well respected and used in matters of government in the region that encompassed present-day Alberta. To that end, for example, ordinances were published in both of these languages.

As Aunger (1989b, 1996, 1998, 2001) has argued, however, the climate of cooperation between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada’s Northwest Territories changed after the influx of a large number of pioneers from Ontario, especially from the 1880s. These new settlers brought with them an understanding of British ideals and public schools that they had experienced in Ontario (Aunger, 1989b, 1998, 2001; Carlyle, 1987; Munro, 1987;). Egerton Ryerson had built up Ontario’s school system to ensure quality education for all, regardless of social class, so that as educated people they could better fulfill their civic responsibilities and uphold the British institutions and ideals. For Ryerson, English-language public education was key to Canada’s stability, prosperity and

favoured position within the British Empire. The perpetuation of an all-English society westward from Ontario was therefore central in the mindset of these settlers.

Berger (1970/2013) illustrated how a sense of imperial entitlement had remained strong in the descendants of the United Empire Loyalist families; and how, based on a shared identification as English-speakers, this mindset had become generalized among many English-speaking Canadians, particularly from Ontario. Once they had become the majority in the NWT, their view dominated through political and economical policies, changing them as needed in order to maintain their command over minority groups such as French Canadians (Denis, 2006, p. 88).

The dual language question was a thorn in the side of many English Canadians formerly from Ontario. The language issue became a target in Northwest Assembly discussions concerning government fiscal restraint measures as early as 1889 when Territorial premier Frederick Haultain and some colleagues led the charge to abolish the official language status of French and eradicate bilingualism from the Northwest Territories (Aunger, 1998, p. 107).

Haultain's views were shared by a contemporary political figure from Ontario with similar designs. D'Alton McCarthy was "head of the Equal Rights Association which was formed to combat Papal interference in Dominion affairs", and leader of the England-based Imperial Federation League in Canada until 1891 (Berger, 1970/2013, p. 134). He was keen to promote the Dominion's ties to the Empire and as MP for Simcoe, D'Alton McCarthy extolled the merits of a unilingual state in the House of Commons and throughout his speaking tour in western Canada in 1889 (Groulx, 1934, p. 155; McLeod, 1979, pp. 60-61, 66; Munro, 1987, p. 40; Aunger, 1998, p. 118; Aunger, 2001, pp. 452-

453). On his tour, McCarthy repeated a stirring speech that left no doubt as to the fierceness of his convictions. Years later even *The Times of London* referenced his most provocative words, in their informative piece about the bilingual situation in Canada in 1913:

No one in Canada apprehends a mortal issue in the contest between French and English, although D'Alton McCarthy, who was an outstanding figure in the public life of the Dominion a quarter of a century ago, often proclaimed that if extension of the French influence were not resisted by ballots in this generation, it would be necessary to use bayonets in the next. (*The Times*, January 17 1913, p. 37)

In Berger's (1970/2013, p. 135) account in which he referenced McCarthy's speech directly and not a news article, bullets replace bayonets. Regardless, McCarthy's sentiment was clear. In 1890, D'Alton McCarthy stood in the House of Commons and proposed an end to Canadian official bilingualism. The 1890 parliamentary debate in Ottawa on this question was passionate according to the account of Groulx (1934). If McCarthy failed to get his resolution passed in the House of Commons, he nevertheless obtained a victory for his supporters in the NWT with an amendment to the Northwest Territories Act (1891) (Hart, 1981, p. 37). This federal legislation allowed more autonomy for the Territorial Assembly to deal with regional decisions in the future (Aunger, 1998). This recognition was in line with the desire for responsible government in the Northwest Territories, another important point of contention of the time. After years of agitation on both fronts, the bilingualism issue in western Canada and the

region's quest for responsible government had formally become officially intertwined, courtesy of the Federal government.

Within a year, the Northwest Assembly passed two pieces of legislation that fundamentally changed the bilingual character of the West. In early 1892, it aimed at eliminating the requirement of French translations of the Territorial government proceedings (Aunger, 1989a, p. 208). This first demonstration of new powers afforded to the Northwest Assembly by Ottawa was followed within months by a second action aimed definitely at ridding the region of French-English bilingualism. The Haultain Resolution of December 31, 1892, established English as the only permissible language of instruction in schools (Aunger, 1998, p.122; Aunger, 2001, p. 465). Since the two resolutions had not required federal support, Haultain's efforts to effectively strip the French language of any official or social standing in the public sphere of the Northwest Territories seemed to have been successful.

By 1988, however, it had been found that the resolution of January 1892 was in fact, invalid, and that the old Northwest Territories Act from 1877 still applied (Aunger, 1998, p. 91). Nevertheless, the fact remained that at the turn of the 20th century, English had become the sole acceptable language for all intents and purposes. The damage to western bilingualism was palpable, especially in matters of education. Such policies of linguistic homogenization took away all the power and prestige historically associated with the French language and its speakers in the NWT, as shown in Aunger (2004a, 2004b). The effective elimination of French from government in January 1892, and from schools in December 1892, reduced not only the influence and practical use of learning

the French language; it also diminished interest in bilingualism and bilingual education among Francophones and non-Francophones.

While French as a language of instruction had been taken out of all the schools in the Northwest Territories by the end of 1892, one exception was made. French was somewhat tolerated in designated primary schools with a large Francophone student population, for a limited time in the day during the first grade. This government sanction was conditional and depended on the willingness of the parents to pay a fee, or “special rate” for no more than one hour of French per day (Aunger, 1996, p. 197). According to Whitehead (2007), the provision of parental choice through fee impositions was established practice in the British culture of education throughout the Empire. However, this choice could not replace English in education. In Whitehaed (1995, p. 8), teaching English in the colonies was still deemed necessary in the 1920s by the local authorities who “stressed the important link between language policy and economic growth”. The same logic prevailed in the NWT at the turn of the 20th century. Aunger (1989a, p. 216) noted that this paid French time could only occur so long as it did not interfere with English language curriculum studies. The Haultain government’s ultimate goal was to ensure economic and political stability and prosperity for the state. An educated population was therefore deemed foundational to the future province’s success.

In 1892, David Goggin was named Superintendent of Schools of the Northwest Territories (Sheehan, 1990, p. 316). Like Haultain in the NWT and Ryerson in Ontario, he believed that quality public education was key to Canadian unity and prosperity under the Union Jack. As the lack of a common language was believed to represent a challenge to this endeavour, the territorial government sought to achieve linguistic assimilation

through very limited bilingual education in designated areas of the province (Aunger, 1989a, 2004a; Mahé 1993). By allowing this, the government ensured that curricular learning was not impeded, even if the students did not understand English at first. As the students' knowledge of English increased, the use of the mother tongue decreased, and by the time students left school for good, they would be more proficient in English than the home language, both in expression and thought. Within a generation or two, it was believed that English would become the home and school language and assimilation would be achieved.

In 1896, this arrangement was increased to include the first two primary grades (Aunger, 1989a, p. 216). In 1901, this offer was opened to include any language other than English and the local school inspectors saw to it that these conditions were respected (Aunger, 2004a, p. 474).

To help ensure French Canadian assimilation through limited French language instruction, the territorial government made use of textbooks. As early as 1896, the government-approved *Bilingual Readers* were used in the authorized French primary course until 1925 (Mahé, 1993, p. 689). Contrary to true bilingual education, these and other prescribed textbooks were designed to create a linguistic one-way bridge that would facilitate the loss of the Francophone student's first language and encourage her assimilation into an English-speaking member of the Dominion and the Empire (Mahé, 1993, p. 689). The use of these books, like the limited use of French in school, was not designed to develop strong language skills in both languages. Rather, these were tactics employed to help make the publicly funded school more attractive to the French-speaking

family as a place for the children to acquire a solid education and to make all students proficient in English, and in English only.

The 1901 School Ordinance of the Northwest Territories was a cornerstone piece of legislation. Concerning language education, the 1901 Ordinance stipulated that English remained the language of instruction but that a degree of French or other languages would be allowed in the schools in order to facilitate non-Anglophone students to learn school subjects as well as English. According to Hart (1981, p. 40), school boards could allow French as the language of instruction at the beginning of the primary course. Moreover, any language other than English, could be taught by competent personnel hired by the school boards (Hart, 1981, p. 40). However, as in the preceding decade, these allowances were made conditional to payment. The costs incurred for such extra language teaching would be recuperated by the school boards through a specific tax that would be applied exclusively to those parents or guardians whose children benefitted from this extra non-English language instruction (Hart, 1981, p. 40). Given that most immigrants could not afford the conditional fee, this “program was seldom implemented . . . as the legislators had probably anticipated” (Aunger, 2004a, p. 474).

As Aunger (2001, p. 479) explained, the turn of the 20th century was a time when “English-Canadian jingoism flourished uninhibited. Unmasked, proponents of national unity were revealed to be crusaders for English domination”. Denis (2006) held the same discourse. According to Sheehan (1990, p. 307), nationalism and imperialism became interchangeable terms in the late 19th century English-Canada. For Berger (1970/2013), the two concepts fused into a Canadian imperialism, that varied according to the emphasis accorded to the militarist, missionary, or economical interests, and that was rooted in the

United Empire Loyalist's reverence for British institutions and imperial unity, based on the conviction that Canada would have a role to play in managing the Empire. Indeed, Stephenson (2010, p. 29) described how "there were multiple discourses through which empire was understood", and that these discourses reflected the differences of people's contexts (e.g., in London as opposed to in far-away Australia; a civil servant with the Board of Education as opposed to a member of an imperial awareness society).

Sheehan (1990, p. 307) explained that this was a time when imperialistic fervor reached new heights with the advent of the Boer Wars in South Africa, the jubilee celebration of Queen Victoria's 60-year reign, and the influx of non-English speaking settlers to Canada. For these reasons, in addition to the large French-speaking population in eastern and central Canada, a portion of the Anglo-Canadian ruling élite, of which ascribed to the tradition of the United Empire Loyalists, made it their mandate to render the Dominion of Canada, including its Northwest Territories, as English as possible in order to safeguard the state and the nation from all the difficulties evoked in the observations of political history by Professor A. E. Freeman, who believed that one commonly spoken language throughout a state was key to its prosperity and stability.

In Canada, Freeman's cautionary words regarding multilingual states seemed well-founded in the wake of the Métis uprisings in the Northwest Territories and Manitoba, the divisive dual language question in education in Manitoba, as well as the problems of the bilingual schools in Ontario (cf. Berger 1970/2013, pp. 49-77; Gaffield, 1987). Therefore, rather than perceive bilingualism as a way to implement harmonious and respectful coexistence and shared citizenship, bilingualism became the scapegoat that explained the long-lasting linguistic tensions between the Francophones and

Anglophones in Québec and Ontario, and the reproduction of similar situations in western Canada.

Freeman's Nation-building Political Theory and its Popularity in Canada

As justification of English superiority was based on a rhetoric of assumed necessity, the assimilation policies since the Haultain Resolution (1892) corresponded perfectly with Freeman's (1892/1879) advised course of action in multilingual states. In such states, the minority language speakers would adopt the dominant language and cultural identity, which, in turn, would increase the sense of their shared patriotism with all society members, and this socio-political unity would promote stability.

The premise that a government, a nation and a language ought to coincide was a concept that had been strongly advocated and discussed at length by Freeman, a prominent Oxford University professor of modern history. His *Historical Essays*, first published together in 1879, was available in a second edition by 1892, the year of Haultain's resolution to oust French from the public space in the North West Territories. Moreover, his sensational chapter V entitled "Race and Language" had originally been published as an article in both the *Fortnightly Review* and *Contemporary Review* in January and February 1877. In this essay, Freeman acknowledged that although the alignment of one state, one nation and one language was rarely the case in reality, he emphasized that this was nevertheless the natural order of things and the ideal towards which everything bent; at least in the Occidental world. Thus, to that end, assimilation, based on the Roman tradition of adoption, was key to the successful western nation-building enterprise.

Whereas the concept of a race based upon purity of bloodlines was nonsensical to Freeman, the concept of race based on an adopted common language — achieved through inherited tradition and/or assimilation, and which bounded nations — was not. Therefore, for all intents and purposes, the measure of a state depended on how it incorporated its diverse elements composing its nation and an important indicator of this was the use of one common language. That was the mentality behind Freeman's statement that, "wherever we go, we find language to be the rough practical test of nationality" (Freeman, 1879/1892, p. 228). In other words, Freeman claimed that the strength and wealth of the nation and of its state were reflected in the degree that one common language was spoken.

In the late 1800s, when Freeman's work was published, his ideas crossed the Atlantic and swept over Canada. His reasoning convinced many English-speakers that unilingualism was the surest safeguard of economic prosperity and political stability. Given the upheaval in the British Empire in the 19th century, caused or exasperated in part by the importance of language in conflicts such as the Boer Wars (1880-1881, 1899-1902) and the similarities of the British colonial experience of the Boers and the French Canadians, Freeman's mantra of 'One Nation, One Language' seemed like a panacea for the socio-political concerns of many of the Anglophone majority in Canada.

Laurie's Nation-building Pedagogy and its Influence in Alberta

The linguistic enterprise promoted by Freeman (1879/1892) in the political sphere was well buttressed in the field of education by Laurie's (1889/1904) views on first and second language instruction. Whereas both British scholars promoted the ideal of one shared language in the interests of the state, Professor Laurie of the University of

Edinburgh perceived that selective and controlled second language education could help solidify the love for, and dominance of, the English language among all British subjects. Laurie encouraged the grammatical mastery and emotional attachment to English, the shared language, by limited learning of other key languages for grammatical and cultural comparisons between those languages and English. In brief, he sought to allow just enough contact with certain foreign languages and cultures through the study of world history and classic literature as to underline what was great in Great Britain and enhance the patriotic feeling around British identity and the English language.

Laurie certainly promoted a particular format in language instruction, imbued with a sense of procedure and purpose: there were ideal subjects and ideal windows of acquisition. Whereas Laurie (1889/1904) exalted the merits of learning Latin or Greek, he esteemed that French or German would be acceptable ‘modern’ languages to learn in lieu. Moreover, he believed that embarking on second language learning was best done at approximately 12 years of age, when the first language (English) and sense of self would be well rooted but still in need of definition (Laurie, 1889/1904). For this scholar, there was no such thing as too much attention to grammar as such exercises promoted mental discipline. Books such as *A French Grammar* (1914) penned by Dr. W.A.R. Kerr, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Alberta, and his colleague Professor E. Sonet, were exactly suited for the purposes of Laurie’s language learning designs.

According to Laurie (1889/1904), some learning of another language was useful to the British student to the degree with which it allowed the student, through comparison, to better master his own language and to understand the glory of his own

nation through different forms of expression. This was his point when he wrote, in deference to the first language (English): “all other tongues we acquire are merely subsidiary; and . . . their chief value in the education of youth is that they help to bring into relief for us the character of our own language as a logical medium of thinking, or help us to understand it as thought, or to feel it as literary art” (Laurie, 1889/1904, p. 19). Furthermore, “it is also through their languages, much more than through a knowledge of their institutions, that we share the lives of those nations which have a literature, and absorb those elements of life in which we are ourselves defective” (Laurie, 1889/1904, p. 5). Clearly, Laurie was someone who agreed with the British imperial culture. He saw the Empire and its history in a favourable light and understood how education, in particular how language education, was vital to British imperial assets and interests, present and future.

Professor Laurie’s view of additional language learning as a way to enrich British patriotism could be interpreted as somewhat mercantilist in nature, to the extent that learning other languages allowed the British to redefine other Nations’ masterpieces. Put another way, Laurie supported the principle of British students’ direct access to the foreign literary treasures, in their original state, in order for British students to translate, interpret, and judge the texts themselves. Laurie wanted them to measure the worth of the foreign classics against the British point of reference. The students would not only carry that representation with them, but they would reflect that idea unto the world. In this way, a British view of the literary treasure would be imposed. Such an enterprise, it was thought, would indubitably increase the British students’ patriotic sentiment, give meaning to their individual pursuits, and thereby profit the nation and empire as a whole.

In Great Britain's colonial educational policy, a similar view was held. According to Whitehead (2007, p. 165), "the primary focus of education was on the discovery of self and the predominantly literary curriculum was designed to enable children to appreciate Britain's cultural heritage by studying the best that had been said and written in the past". While Whitehead maintained the existence of a difference between policy theory and policy practice, highlighting the variance in the educational experience between all corners of the Empire, his point largely supports Laurie's view of British education.

As shown by the reports by the Department of Education of the province of Alberta from 1905 and throughout the 1920s, the education policy was characterized by Professor Laurie's work. The study of the French language, deemed a foreign language by many Anglo-Canadians, was generally circumspective in scope and in breadth. It was aimed at French second-language learners as opposed to French first-language speakers. In compliance with Laurie's ideals, the objective was not the facilitation of communication between Francophones and Anglophones in the province, but rather the fostering of a British identity by interpretive comparison with France through her language and literature.

Alexander Cameron Rutherford's personal reading preferences may be reflective of Laurie's views on second language education in order to "share the lives of those nations which have a literature, and absorb those elements of life in which we are ourselves defective" (Laurie, 1889/1904, p. 5). Like other English speakers in Alberta, Rutherford grew up in Ontario. A graduate from McGill, Montréal's elite English language university, Rutherford the lawyer came westward and, upon Prime Minister

Laurier's choice, became Alberta's first Premier. Rutherford was not only Premier but Minister of Education as well.

Whitehead's (2007) claimed that education in the corners of the Empire depended on the will of the local top government authority in the field. As both Premier and Minister of Education, A. C. Rutherford was determined to make education a priority in the province of Alberta. Rutherford established the University of Alberta with a most capable leader in the person of Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, formerly of McGill, and a host of forward thinking scholars, including Dr. W. A. R. Kerr. Rutherford's literary collection was also donated to the university, creating the basis of Rutherford Library's holdings. An avid reader, Rutherford's huge and diverse literature collection even included many diverse works in French spanning botany, medical knowledge, Acadian history, copies of French language newspapers from eastern Canada, proceedings from a 1913 conference entitled *Les survivances françaises au Canada* (Édouard Montpetit, 1914), and a collection of speeches made in Québec by the Hon. Lomer Gouin in 1907, as listed in the University of Alberta archives (Bloor McLaren, 1992). It can be surmised that he was thus somewhat familiar with the French Canadian mindset and aspirations, including the different liberal viewpoints as represented by Laurier and Gouin respectively (cf. Betcherman, 2002; MacFarlane, 1999). Rutherford was also aware of influential thinkers in education such as Laurie, given that the latter's work was required reading for all aspiring teachers in the province for many decades.

Evidence of Laurie's influence on Rutherford and the Alberta education system was perhaps most obvious in the teaching courses. For many years, the prescribed textbooks stipulated for teacher education specifically listed Laurie's 1904 book, the

fourth edition of *Lectures on Language*. As evidenced by a report by the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta for 1911, examinations for would-be teachers were full of questions explicitly associated with Professor Laurie's course lectures at the University of Edinburgh, and presented again at Cambridge and the College of Preceptors in London, England. For example, the student-teacher was asked to explain Laurie's meaning and logic in the following statement: "Language then, is and must always be the supreme subject in the education of a human being" (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1912, p. 215). Early on in Alberta, the first-class and second-class teaching certificate examinations specifically required an understanding of Laurie's work (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1912, Appendix H, pp. 200-229). Given the emphasis on Laurie's views of language learning, the aim was clearly not simple regurgitation of information, but integration of his pedagogy into the new teacher's sense of responsibility so that it would shape her future practice and bias in the classroom.

In Alberta, as an emerging state, English language teaching was essential and that job rested with the teacher. Unlike in Whitehead's (1995; 2007) articles concerning other parts of the Empire, not only was there was no question in Alberta that English should be learned and used by everyone, but the province's annual reports by the Department of Education displayed meticulous and exacting plans for not only the schoolhouses and related physical requirements of a proper education, but for the substance of education as well. The government of Alberta emphasized the acquisition and proper use of the English language according to the writings of Laurie throughout grade school and teacher education. Even school inspectors' reports in the province of Alberta were particularly

attentive to language learning. When perusing the Department of Education reports between 1905 and 1930, it is hard to find one where English language skills were not discussed by the school inspectors, either in terms of progress made, or lack thereof.

In most of the Department of Education reports, there was an acknowledgement of slow but steady progress in the assimilation endeavour of the public school. In reports between 1907 and 1909, Robert Fletcher, Supervisor of Schools for Foreigners, routinely credited any advancement in a foreign language settlement in Alberta to the people's willingness to accept the unilingual English-speaking schoolteacher for their children. For Mr. Fletcher, it was impossible to provide good English language skills in a bilingual system. In the 1910 report, he went as far as to state that "a perceptible advance in general intelligence is noticeable among the masses of the Ruthenian people" (Department of Education, 1911, p. 69) and that this was partly on account "to their mixing with intelligent English-speaking people" (Department of Education, 1911, p. 70). Mahé (1997, 2000, 2001) has argued that school inspectors were responsible for ensuring that the English language was taught and learned well, in order to better inculcate the youth in Alberta with the British worldview.

The Liberal governments of Rutherford, Sifton, and Stewart and the UFA governments of Greenfield and Brownlee, all followed the approach in education of limited and purposeful foreign language training, akin to that proposed in Laurie's *Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method in the School* (1889/1904). The study of French was incorporated as an optional subject in the upper grades of the Albertan curriculum. Moreover, for decades, the prescribed literary choices under study were Eurocentric works of French literature—despite the growing availability of French-

Canada focused literature such as *Les Anciens Canadiens* (1863), and *Maria Chapedelaine* (1916) —and for the chief purpose of sight translation and comparison. Conversely, the Eurocentric tendency was also predominant in English-language texts as well (Tomkins, 1985/2008). Mandated Eurocentric literature was listed in the Regulations section of the Report of the Department of Education for 1916 (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1917c).

The literary choices in Alberta education were purposely Eurocentric and shaped not only the world view but Alberta's place within it. Berger (1970/2013, p. 50) recalled the significance for Charles Mair of a "native literature" as "both an infallible signal of the development of a national consciousness and the chief source of its nourishment". The Department of Education's choices of non-Canadian works had implications in how people in Alberta viewed themselves in comparison with others across the Atlantic. Moreover, the Rutherford government's legacy of *The Alexandra Readers* serves as concrete evidence of the aspiration to British standards in Alberta's educational system, in line with Professor Laurie's views.

Assimilation Through Public Education in Alberta After 1905

In the Northwest Territories, British imperial ideals were deeply rooted in the public schools through the means of English grammar and composition, literature, geography and history, under the direction of David Goggin, Superintendent of Schools (Sheehan, 1990, p. 316). Once Alberta became a province in 1905, the Department of Education continued its Anglo-dominant nation-building enterprise and followed the same curriculum established in the province of Ontario (von Heyking, 2006, p. 1130). This was no doubt facilitated by the earlier adoption of Ontario school system in the

Northwest Territories. However, when it came to the students' readers, Rutherford envisioned something grander than *The Ontario Readers*. Rutherford not only wanted English language reading material that would sow the seeds of British admiration, he wanted these texts to be easily accessible to all students, and to become every boy's and girl's treasure, regardless of their family situation.

The Department of Education of the province of Alberta was committed to its educational mission to foster English language literacy and strong British patriotism among the province's multicultural population. Evidence of this commitment is *The Alexandra Readers*, the first publication of the Alberta government (Sheehan, 1990, p. 316). These readers, named after a beloved queen who had become British by choice through marriage, were a constant reminder to school children of all backgrounds to emulate the qualities of their kind sovereign. According to the Alberta and Saskatchewan teachers' *Handbook for Alexandra Readers* (1914), "the title chosen for this series met with general acceptance as Alexandra, both as Princess of Wales and as Queen, had endeared herself not only to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, but also to the people of the Dominion across the Seas" (Government of Alberta [?], p. 1).

Paid and provided by the Alberta government, these readers were distributed free of charge to all school children in the province, thereby encouraging reading English language material that would inspire their imaginations with tales of England's beauty and glory (Sheehan, 1990, p. 316). Such literature was often part of British education overseas (Whitehead, 2007). In this endeavour, Rutherford's initiative mirrored the British commemorative booklet published for school children at the occasion of the coronation of Edward VII that "aimed at instilling an imperial spirit, loyalty to and

admiration for Britain” (Stephenson, 2010, p. 26). In a speech to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, February 25, 1908, Premier Rutherford, in his dual capacity of Minister of Education and Provincial Treasurer, asked the government to increase the School Grants by \$14,000, the amount required to cover the cost of *The Alexandra Readers* for two years. In Rutherford’s words, not only were these readers better priced than the ones used in Manitoba but these “readers contain much more matter and their attractiveness and mechanism are much superior to any readers that are to be found in Canada to-day” (Rutherford, 1908, p. 23). Rutherford believed that an aesthetically pleasing book would encourage readership interest and facilitate the mission of public English language education.

These free readers were a source of pride for the Rutherford government. Although there is no mention of assistance from the Imperial government in provincial papers, there is a mention of such assistance in the Report of the Imperial Education Conference of 1911. Accordingly, the report for 1911 stated that since the conference of 1907, the Office of Special Inquiries had advised the Government of Alberta “in the selection and despatch of new books on educational subjects” (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 31). This assistance was significant as Alberta had been the only state that was acknowledged in the report to have had availed itself of this service.

Not only were *The Alexandra Readers* authorized by the Alberta government, but Premier Rutherford had convinced the Saskatchewan government to follow suite. Originally published by Morang in 1908, the continued publication of these readers was assured by Macmillan of Canada as of 1921 (Whiteman, Stewart, and Funnell, 1985). In accordance with Professor Freeman and Professor Laurie’s views, *The Alexandra*

Readers promoted English language learning and British patriotism throughout the two provinces for decades.

Conclusion

Until the influx of quantities of settlers from Ontario, there had been cooperation between French-speakers and English-speakers in the Northwest Territories. Respect for the French language in education and all matters of government ended when newcomers from Ontario arrived in large numbers and asserted their will. They demanded a socio-political framework like in Ontario in order to transform the Prairies into a united and strong English-speaking region of the Dominion, worthy of its membership in the British Empire. To achieve this aim, a concentrated effort to reduce the importance of French in society prevailed by eliminating it from government and curtailing it in schools in view of elimination.

The NWT School Ordinance of 1901, like the Haultain Resolution of 1892, sustained a project of assimilation. At a time when school attendance was difficult to enforce, limited tolerance of languages other than English encouraged parents to send their children to school where they could get some education in their home language while learning English. Not only did this promote education to the masses, it allowed the government to systematically enforce a type of bilingual education that resulted in assimilation. Once English was understood well enough to continue to learn solely in that language, French or the other home languages were no longer accepted in school. The facilitated access to attractive English language books further sustained the long-term aim of the assimilation of non-English speaking students and the creation of an Anglo-dominant educated population. The provincial government's successful exploitation of

connections, garnered at the Federal Conference on Education (FCE) in 1907, to bring to fruition its common free reading book project, had also attracted the attention of the imperial authorities in education. Having received such recognition, at the IEC 1911, Alberta was aware of the importance of the IECs and was in a good position to further cultivate a relationship with British authorities. Accordingly, within less than two decades, the province's assimilatory stance on French-English bilingual education would be challenged by these conferences and undergo a profound change.

Chapter 5: Little Known British Conferences of Great Importance

For all the rhetoric and legislation disclaiming the evils and perils of bilingualism in the English-speaking world at the dawn of the 20th century, and the socio-political choices this rhetoric promoted, French-English bilingual education was not evinced in Canada. It is noteworthy that at that time, bilingual education was experiencing a rise in popularity within the British Empire. This ensuing struggle for and against bilingual education was well expressed during a series of conferences on education in London, England where bilingual education was thoroughly debated by invested parties representing different corners of the Empire.

These Imperial Education Conferences (IECs), though rarely even mentioned in local newspapers but somewhat covered in *The Times of London*, stand as a timeline of benchmarks with which can be compared the development of bilingual education in Alberta. Some might even say that these conferences were “policy networks resulting from the interaction of the pre-existing state structure and the organization of society at a critical time in history” (Jann & Wegrich, 2007, p. 50, referencing Lehmbruch, 1991). The British Empire at this time was transitioning into the Commonwealth and the relationships between the British Parliament and the various states of the Empire/Commonwealth were being forged anew, as the subject of dominion autonomy nuanced the discussions at the Imperial Conferences. Such was the context in which developed the distinct Imperial Education Conferences. This chapter will review the highlights of British-Canadian political interactions as they informed the IECs.

The Politics of the Imperial Conferences

From the late 19th century and into the 20th century, a series of Imperial Conferences (ICs) were organized by government agencies. Notably, at least two of these fifteen conferences were held in Ottawa, Canada; the remainder were hosted in London, England. These month-long meetings assembled leaders from throughout the British Empire to promote favourable political and economic policies and relations among the represented governments. The ICs were important encounters for invested parties to learn, make known, and push forward projects of mutual concern. As such they provided an opportunity for policy transfer, “how governments learn from the experiences of other governments”, thereby encouraging the likelihood of knowledge uptake, “how decision makers locate, assess, and incorporate ideas from scholars and other experts in a field”, as explained in Tepper (2004, p. 532). The ICs, then, were significant on account of their potential to help transform the relations between Great Britain and the responsible governments of nations with which it shared a common history. This was especially important at a time when the Empire was becoming the Commonwealth, a voluntary association of countries with ties to the UK.

The ICs, Imperialism, and the Commonwealth

During the first three decades of the 20th century, the question of autonomy for the dominions was a contentious issue that informed the discussions at the Imperial Conferences (ICs). British Prime Ministers, the Liberal Lloyd George during the war and until 1922, as well as the Conservative Baldwin for most of the 1920s, shared a similar vision of a common foreign policy with the dominions (Constantine, 1991; Williamson, 1982). While Australia and New Zealand appeared to be satisfied so long as their needs

for security were met, Canada, South Africa and the Irish Free State were not (Betcherman, 2002; Constantine, 1991; Cook, 1963; MacFarlane, 1999; Thompson & Seager, 1985). At this time, there was tension in South Africa between General Smuts who had favoured staying within the Empire as a dominion and General Hertzog who had preferred outright independence. Tension also characterized the debate in the Irish Free State. In Canada, the tension resided between French Canadians and English Canadians, and amongst Autonomists who opposed a common imperial foreign policy, and Imperialists who espoused a common imperial foreign policy (Berger, 1970/2013; Betcherman, 2002; Cook, 1963; MacFarlane, 1999). The significance of the Privy Council in the dominions, for example, varied according to the different positions and population cross sections.

The ICs, Autonomy, and the Commonwealth

Among Canadians, the support for dominion autonomy depended on their vision of Canada's role within the British Empire or within the British Commonwealth. Canadian Imperialists' sense of entitlement to have a say in imperial policy in order to ensure unity stemmed from the United Empire Loyalist tradition (Berger, 1970/2013). Advocates of a united Commonwealth perceived dominion autonomy as achieving sovereignty in both domestic and international matters while remaining on the best of terms with Great Britain. For MacFarlane (1999), Betcherman (2002) and Cook (1963), many English as well as French Canadians were in favour of dominion autonomy that allowed dominions to have their own foreign policies, with loosened ties to Great Britain, as in a Commonwealth.

The transformation from Empire to Commonwealth was strongly supported by John W. Dafoe, a high profiled spokesman for (English) Canadian Liberal nationalism and the editor of the powerful newspaper, the *Manitoba Free Press* (Cook, 1963, p. 170). Following Cook (1963) as well as Cook and Macrae (1965), Dafoe's unrelenting crusade in favour of the autonomy for the dominions and the progression towards the establishment of the Commonwealth were two sides of the same coin. According to Cook (1963, p. 144), Dafoe believed that "the ideal of a voluntary association of autonomous nations", the Commonwealth, was recognized at the Imperial Conference in 1923. The following Imperial Conference (1926) may have delineated the principles in the form of the Balfour Declaration, but it was as a result of the agreement achieved at "the Imperial Conference of 1923 . . . one of the most important meetings in the history of the British Empire", where Canada and South Africa each played a role (Cook, 1963, pp. 140, 143).

The recognition of the autonomous character of the dominions had figured prominently in the minds of English-speaking Canadians like Dafoe leading up to the Imperial Conferences of 1923 and 1926 (Cook, 1963; Cook & Macrae, 1965). As have argued Betcherman (2002) and MacFarlane (1999), the consistent attention to make the most of every opportunity in order to further Canada's autonomy had also been important to many French Canadians. The struggle for dominion autonomy therefore became a uniting factor for many French and English Canadians.

The promotion of Canadian autonomy by Liberal Prime Minister Laurier at pre-war Imperial Conferences had set the stage (Betcherman, 2002; Cook, 1963). The Resolution IX at the War Conference (1917) had acknowledged but left undefined the "the equality of the British nations" (Cook, 1963, p. 131; cf. Thompson & Seager, 1985).

This lack of definition had occasioned diplomatic problems leading up to and during the Washington Conference (1921), where the South African Prime Minister Smuts, as opposed to the Canadian Prime Minister Meighen, was lauded in the *Free Press* on account of his vocal critique of the procedure (Cook, 1963, p. 136). The presence of the Canadian delegation at the Peace Conference (1919) had provided insights about European politics, the potential of an international organization and the necessity of defining Canada's autonomous status (Betcherman, 2002; Cook, 1963, pp. 88-92; MacFarlane, 1999; Thompson & Seager, 1985). This need was made more apparent at the Imperial Conference (1921), as Canada and Australia and New Zealand were in disagreement over the dominion's role in naval security, given the lack "of consensus among Britain and the dominions upon which to construct foreign policy" (Thompson & Seager, 1985, p. 39).

In the Mackenzie King Liberal administrations, Ernest Lapointe, as opposed to Lomer Gouin, figured prominently during the 1920s. Lapointe valued the ordinary French Canadians and he saw autonomy as a good thing for them as well as for English Canadians. Lapointe strongly encouraged the English Canadian Prime Minister's efforts for autonomy. Betcherman (2002) and MacFarlane (1999) agree that Mackenzie King, though in favour of autonomy but concerned not to strain imperial relations to the breaking point, would never have gone as far and as fast had it not been for Ernest Lapointe's constant urging. Affirmation of Canada's self-determination in the Chanak Affair (1922) by the Liberal Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King had been a step forward, and the Halibut Treaty (1923) despite evidence of attempted British involvement, had also signified change (Betcherman, 2002; Cook, 1963, pp. 137-138;

MacFarlane, 1999; Thompson & Seager, 1985). Thompson and Seager (1985, p. 47) qualified the 1923 Imperial Conference as a “most significant step in the transformation of the British Empire into a looser commonwealth”. Indeed, the acceptance of dominion autonomy at the 1923 Imperial Conference had been highly acclaimed by Dafoe (Cook, 1963, p. 144).

According to Cook (1963, p. 175), the Locarno Pacts (1925) provided an international first test of 1923’s principle of dominion recognition. Betcherman (2002) and MacFarlane (1999) attributed this success to Lapointe’s insistence that dominions had the right to refuse to sign the treaty in order to disassociate themselves from any responsibility incurred by Great Britain in the event of a conflict. Significantly, no dominion signed the treaty. Mackenzie King’s opposition to “automatic commitments” had triumphed over his hesitancy faced with the Imperial government’s clear preference for a show of imperial solidarity by having all the Dominion’s signatures (MacFarlane, 1999, p. 58). As this would/could have been interpreted as a shared imperial policy, meaning that all dominions could have a voice in its formulation but that they all had to automatically abide *en bloc* with the decided imperial policy, it had been imperative that Mackenzie King refuse to sign. This said, according to Thompson and Seager’s (1985) account, the Imperial government didn’t wish to consult with dominions and never invited them to participate in the negotiations of the Locarno Pacts (1925).

At long last, the Balfour Declaration at the 1926 Imperial Conference clearly enunciated Canada’s complete autonomy (Betcherman, 2002; Cook, 1963, pp. 179-182; MacFarlane, 1999; Thompson & Seager, 1985). The Balfour Declaration became the foundation of the Statute of Westminster (1931) where dominions were recognized

States, responsible for their own foreign policies. In the interim, Canada effectively established a legation in Washington, separate from the British embassy (Thompson & Seager, 1985). In addition, the Dominion of Canada aimed for a seat on the League of Nations Council, “and with the support of Britain, did become the first dominion to sit on Council” (MacFarlane, 1999, p. 70). These actions again affirmed Canada’s autonomous character within the international as well as imperial communities. Up to that point in 1927, British foreign secretary Chamberlain “had insisted that he spoke for the entire empire at the League” (MacFarlane, 1999, p. 70). In 1926 at the IC, it had been remarked in *The Edmonton Journal* that while the “British Empire” was a member of the League of Nations’ covenant, as were Canada, South Africa, etc., “Newfoundland is not, nor apparently is Great Britain . . . which is one of the technicalities to be straightened out at the conference” (Bowman, November 3 1926, p. 2). This technicality may have encouraged Chamberlain to speak on behalf of the British Empire.

It seems however that in 1927, Chamberlain had still not fully accepted Canadian autonomy, despite the dominion’s seat on League of Nations Council. Throughout 1928, Williamson (1982) reported that Chamberlain championed the British Conservatives’ land settlement scheme in Canada. According to Williamson (1982, p. 399), the plan for the British government to purchase property in Canada to encourage British immigration was finally abandoned in 1929 due to “Canadian objections”. By 1931, the Commonwealth was inaugurated and the dominions’ autonomous status was official.

The ICs, the Bond Among English-speaking Nations and the League of Nations

By Cook’s (1963) account, Canada’s membership in the Commonwealth (1931) and the League of Nations (1918) was of the utmost importance for Dafoe as a guarantee

of sovereignty and collective security. The Commonwealth was based on a shared “moral unity which held the members together when their interests were threatened” (Cook, 1963, p. 178). However, as MacFarlane (1999) and Betcherman (2002) have explained, the League’s potential infringement on a member’s sovereignty was nevertheless alarming for the Canadian governments from the beginning. Even the British were concerned over that potential, according to Constantine (1991). This said, in 1923, following the acceptance in practice of the Canadian amendment to the Covenant’s Article X concerning military measures, such worries were past and Dafoe’s perception of Canadian acceptance among international partners seemed fulfilled.

The League of Nations not only allowed Canada to interact “as the equal of other nations in an organization which included the emancipated dominions”, it made this possible “without bearing the stigma of imperialism” (Cook, 1963, p. 171). According to Cook (1963), Dafoe envisioned Canada as a mediator, bridging Great Britain and the United States, and as such, bringing together the strength of the English-speaking world in order to better offset any threat to international peace (Cook, 1963, pp. 184-186). Dr. J. A. Macdonald, editor of *The Toronto Globe*, had held a similar view in 1911 when he had addressed the Winnipeg Canadian Club, along with Sir Joseph Ward of New Zealand who was *en route* to the Imperial Conference (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, April 7 1911, p. 2). Contrary to the image of Canada as a bond between English-speaking states, however, Thompson and Seager’s (1985, p. 55) felt that Canada’s actions in the League of Nations had “seriously undermined” the collective security that Article X had been designed to achieve and maintain.

The vision for dominion autonomy was nurtured at the Imperial Conferences as much as it pushed the ICs to change the imperial relationship. Although a causal link cannot be proven, it can nevertheless be said that Canada's struggle for dominion autonomy at the ICs was related to its engagement in the world and within the League of Nations. While the question of dominion autonomy and its repercussions had occupied the ICs over the years, the question of bilingual education had been evolving at the IECs.

The Nature of the Imperial Education Conferences

In step with the larger Imperial Conferences that focused on economic and political issues, these separate series of weeklong conferences were called to deal exclusively with educational matters throughout the British Empire/Commonwealth. In addition, the summits on education met on different dates than the economic and political summits, and assembled academics and government officials engaged in education as opposed to heads of state. While both sets of conferences had met within weeks of each other in the spring of 1907 and 1911, the Imperial Education Conferences were moved to the early summer as of 1923, and the other conferences to mid-autumn. This said, there existed a possibility of coordination between the two distinct series of conferences in the event of issues of mutual concern and overlapping policy requirements. Such a policy outcome "resulting from the interaction of different actors *and* different programs" (Jann & Wegrich, 2007, p. 53, emphasis was by the authors) had occurred at the IEC in 1927 in regard to teacher exchanges following the IC in 1926.

An overview of the FCE and the IECs

Designated as the Federal Conference on Education (FCE), the 1907 conference marked the beginning of the series of five conferences on education over a twenty-year

period. The intent had been to hold them every four years after 1907, but WWI interrupted the schedule after the 1911 conference. While there was a meeting in 1919 to discuss issues related to the war and the transition to a demilitarized world, it wasn't until 1923 and again in 1927 that the leaders from across the Empire continued the discussions from 1911.

The 1919 conference was a special meeting with a preoccupation with the military. As it was without a bilingual education session, or discussions pertaining to the experience of the school aged child, it will not be reviewed in depth. It is noted here, however, as this was a conference where Alberta had a strong presence. Past Premier Rutherford, as well as University of Alberta President, Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, were known in London for their dedication to and involvement with Khaki University, a specially designed education service for the returning soldier of the Empire. This initiative demonstrated the scope of the social reforms initiated by the then British Prime Minister Lloyd George and the eagerness at the University of Alberta to take on an important role in an imperial measure. While Khaki University was a prominent issue at the 1919 conference, and serves to testify to the *rapprochement* between London and Alberta, the project itself falls outside the parameters of this project. This said, all the Imperial Education Conferences (including the FCE) were opportunities for increased recognition of the diversity within the changing Empire while simultaneously strengthening the sentiments of solidarity of its membership within the context of the debate over autonomy for the dominions.

The other four conferences on education directly dealt with, among other things, bilingual education and other issues that could impact bilingual education, such as

teacher exchanges, or interchanges as they were termed. Without contest, both topics were of great importance to the development of a more flexible and responsive coordination of systems of education. However, as bilingual education is the focus of this project, teacher and inspector interchanges as well as all related themes will be presented here in light of their relation to bilingual education.

Unlike the conferences of 1907, 1911 and 1923, the Imperial Education Conference (IEC) of 1927 discussed the value of vernaculars in bilingual education as well as the educational value of emerging technologies. These technologies, such as the radio, were increasingly part of daily life in the Commonwealth and attracted attention. Wireless communications and cinema could not only be great tools for language learning, but could serve broader educational interests by bringing London or exotic faraway lands and peoples to school children throughout the British Empire. The use of technology in the classroom, combined with teacher exchanges, had the potential to not only inform, but to create an emotional connection between the audiences and the subject matter. This in turn could promote a better understanding, and a stronger sense of interconnectedness, between different people under the Union Jack. This emphasis on inclusion through the use of vernaculars in education, teacher exchanges, and technology in the classroom certainly had implications for bilingual education and for these reasons the conference of 1927 will be discussed in addition to the conferences of 1907, 1911, and 1923.

Rooted in a commitment to British institutions and values, these regular quadrennial encounters, with exception to the war years, facilitated the sharing of knowledge and experience among members of a far-flung group. These members, while widespread and developing within unique local or regional contexts, nonetheless often

faced similar local obstacles in the field of education, such as increasing public education access, lengthening the number of years in school attendance, or expanding the curriculum to include more subjects such as music, physical and health education, and to incorporate new medias, such as the gramophone, the radio, and cinematic features. Moreover, these conferences encouraged a collective coordination to respond to educational difficulties that transpired borders, such as teacher education, teacher qualification recognition, and teacher exchanges within the Empire.

Opportunities to Shape Political Agendas and Policy

The IECs, especially the sessions on bilingual education, as well as the ICs were also illustrative of policy transfer and knowledge uptake, as mentioned in Tepper (2004). These institutionalized assemblies were organized to help address common concerns, create a shared understanding, and coordinate mutually accepted measures that would effectively promote stronger ties among the dominions, the colonies and Great Britain. The stronger ties created by the sessions on bilingual education at the IECs were ties of solidarity between some of the national minorities that confronted the preconception of English unilingual education as they pushed for a larger definition of legitimate education to include bilingual education.

As in the case of the ICs, the question of dominion autonomy was part of the context at the IECs and while some members like Australia promoted a stronger supportive role for Whitehall in overseas education (e.g., in regard to educational films), other members such as Canada were clear about each state's autonomy in education (e.g., in bilingual education). The question of autonomy perhaps most resonated in the sessions on bilingual education. Characterized by the British tradition of loose overseas

educational policies, as seen in Whitehead (2007), the IECs' sessions on bilingualism were organized as presentations and discussions between member nations, as opposed to lectures by Whitehall officials and experts, as put forward in Stephenson's (2010) critique of the overall FCE of 1907 and IEC of 1911.

The first educational assembly in 1907 was organized by the Federal Council of the League of the Empire, at the request of various Departments of Education of the Empire; the following assemblies were undertaken by the Imperial Government (Federal Council of the League of the Empire, 1908, p.6). Jann and Wegrich (2007) have argued that parties with vested interests, either part of government or not, typically engage in influencing the agenda of forums, such as what occurred in 1907.

Stephenson (2010) has complained that the value of these conferences was lessened as they were but an orchestration of an imperially minded upper class group with influence that coerced government involvement. However, Whitehead (2007) has explained how non-governmental groups were customarily the leaders in British education projects at this time. Moreover, Jann and Wegrich (2007) have also argued, in reference to Wilson (1989), how government departments (e.g., the Board of Education at Whitehall) when faced with competition, will usually strive undertake the management of dossiers in order to gain access to influential non-government groups in the hopes of establishing their stronger position vis-à-vis other departments. Whereas Stephenson (2010) noted the resistance of government officials to get involved in the conferences, she limited her commentary to the assemblies in 1907 and 1911, without seeing the whole cycle and the way the government officials dealt with the following Imperial Education Conferences. In addition, though she referenced Lord Strachcona as a

Canadian viewpoint, she didn't mention the invitation to Premier Rutherford, who was also Minister of Education of Alberta, to join the Representative Council of the League, or any subsequent meeting in between 1907 and 1911 (League of the Empire, 1907, 1908[?]). By limiting her focus on the two initial conferences and without reference to the Representative Council of the League, Stephenson (2010) provided a partial view of the developments. In particular, Stephenson's (2010) portrayal neglected to capture the development of momentum in the sessions on bilingual education over the span of several years, as representatives of member nations gathered at regular intervals to build upon past discussions (cf. Tepper, 2004).

In addition to these characteristics of seemingly effective policy forums – regular meetings within an institutionalized framework in order promote additional conversations – Tepper (2004, p. 534) has argued that recommendations should be “based on credible information and geared to the practical needs of policymakers” while taking into account the financial costs and the political realities. Despite the impossibility of directly attributing policy implementation to policy forums, Tepper (2004) maintained that where changes have occurred following policy forums, these forums have had certain characteristics that imply a connection.

With British recognition of the Transvaal in 1907, followed in 1910 by the recognition of the Union of South Africa as a dominion and that dominion's participation at the ICs and the IECs over the years, a window of opportunity was created, following Kingdon's multiple stream model (Kingdon, 1995, as cited in Jann & Wegrich, 2007, p. 47; Kingdon, 1984, as cited in Tepper, 2004, p. 529). Wales was no longer the only well-established national minority with a successful bilingual education program, as compared

with Ireland's and central and eastern Canada's poor bilingual school experiences (cf. Farrell, 1968; Macnamara, 1966; Merchant, 1912). At the IECs in 1907, 1911 and 1923, Welsh and South African representatives were both credible advocates of bilingual education and "sought to influence and collectively shape the agenda" (Jann & Wegrich, 2007, pp. 45-46).

The enduring presence of South Africa at the Imperial Education Conferences changed the context. A problem stream was identified (i.e. the bilingual problem) and initially discussed as of the first meeting in 1907. From the "popular and less popular alternatives and ideas" in circulation, what Tepper (2004, p. 529) referred to as the "policy primordial soup", a policy stream took shape through discussions in 1911 and following the war in 1923 (e.g., the Welsh and the South African bilingual education experiences, the perspective of the representation from Canada and India, the value of psychometric tests). Years had been spent returning to the topic and "softening up . . . important audiences – until the opportunity structure opens up" (Tepper, 2004, p. 531). With the end of WWI, British Prime Minister Lloyd George's continued social reforms, particularly the Leathes Report (1918) and the Education Act (1918), in addition to the establishment of the League of Nations (1919), and the Imperial Conference (1923), a window of opportunity did open in 1923.

The anticipated window was a combination of circumstances. Despite British budgetary cutbacks and the replacement of the Liberal Lloyd George by the Conservatives Bonar Law/Baldwin by 1923, the League of Nations still required the Imperial Government to provide annual reports on its practices throughout the British Empire/Commonwealth. Whitehead (2007, p. 170) has argued that the "overall impact of

the League was minimal but it did provide a . . . world forum for judging colonial policies”. This world forum in addition to the recognition of dominion autonomy at the IC the same year would have made it more difficult for the British Conservatives to ignore or oppose the national minorities, such as the Welsh (as Liberal Lloyd George’s power base) and the Afrikaners (with Prime Minister Smuts, a strong dominion autonomist). Within this perfect storm, the scales were tipped in favour of bilingual education at the IEC: a committee was established and formulated six recommendations and, as the bandwagon effect continued, these were unanimously accepted by the conference community, in line with Kingdon’s (1984, as cited in Tepper, 2004) notion of a political stream.

The recommendations in 1923 concerning bilingual education were not only consensus-based guidelines, they were official recognition from peers and London of the legitimacy of bilingual education.

The Value of Non-Binding Conference Recommendations

A shared feature of the ICs, and the IECs, concerned the non-binding nature of the policy decisions. In relation to the IC of 1923, Cook (1963, p. 144) mentioned that the responsible governments involved were accorded the freedom to interpret these policies for themselves, without any legal imposition; this had incurred great favour with Dafoe. The same flexibility had marked IEC recommendations, in sharp contrast to France’s strict “overriding educational policy” (Whitehead, 2007, p. 164). As evidenced by Whitehead (1995, 2007), British educational policy in the colonies was purposely meant to be adaptable to local conditions.

However, such flexibility could be a double-edged sword. Indeed, Tepper (2004, p. 534) warned that strategic forums have a better chance of informing policy when these forums generate clear decisions, as opposed to vague recommendations. In the case of the IEC in 1911, Stephenson (2010, p. 24) described the lack of specific objectives as follows: “there was a degree of ambivalence amongst officials, at the Board of Education in London, the Colonial Office, the colonies and the dominions about what imperial education was and/or should be”. Whitehead (2007, p. 166) insisted however that ambiguity was recognition of the inherent unique situations throughout the Empire/Commonwealth and the Imperial Government trusted in the local authorities to best manage the educational outcomes despite the innumerable pressures or disadvantages that presented themselves.

Whitehead’s (2007) position acknowledged Jann and Wegrich (2007) who had also remarked that despite policymakers’ intentions, how the policy is implemented is ultimately dependant on the agents on the ground. Jann and Wegrich (2007) noted that there were no guarantees that these parties would adhere to the policymakers’ intentions, given that they could modify, put off, or cancel the policy altogether. The interpretation of the Hon. A.C. Rutherford, Premier and Minister of Education of Alberta, of the 1907 FCE conference discussions regarding standardized vocabulary and uniform books is an example of this.

Whitehead’s (2007) point also found support in Tepper (2004, p. 534) who stipulated the importance that recommendations be “cognizant of political realities”. What may be possible at one time, or in one place, may not be at another time, or in another place. In Ontario, for example, Merchant (1912) referenced the 1911 Imperial

Education Conference support for bilingual education. The desired effect was not achieved and the provincial government enacted legislation against bilingual education. Dr. Merchant went on to participate in future Imperial Education Conferences, and co-chaired another commission that supported bilingual education in 1927. At that time, the political realities in Ontario had changed just enough to allow the new provincial government to act favourably on the second commission's proposals.

The value of reoccurring meetings then becomes apparent in order to allow for a change in opinion and/or make use of opportune moments (cf. Tepper, 2004). Given the disparity of conditions in the dominions, colonies, etc., and the uncertainty involved in policy implementation, the IEC resolutions were best as non-binding policies.

Non-binding policies, by definition, cannot have rule of law. Yet, the IEC remained important, despite their recommendations' lack of legal enforcement. Within the greater context of the dominion autonomy debate, it was necessary that these recommendations be discretionary, allowing officials the choice to be inspired by them to and to the degree that befitted their contexts. Well-designed regular meetings, even more so than written reports, increase the chances to generate acceptable policy recommendations and see these policies become part of the local context at some point, in some form (cf. Tepper, 2004; Jann & Wegrich, 2007).

Tepper (2004, p. 534) saw that meetings that were "designed from the beginning for sustained follow-up, are more likely to have a long-term impact on policy". At the IECs, the presentations and conversations in the bilingualism sessions became more involved and engaging every year, building momentum that gave way to a set of clear

recommendations in 1923, and that in turn inspired additional discussions in 1927 regarding the use of vernaculars.

Based on Lewis, Abelson, McLeod and Gold (2002, as referenced in Tepper, 2004, p. 532), it is unlikely that the recommendations would have occurred without any chance for the participants to see each other and share exchanges over time. Moreover, “such convenings often reveal interrelationships and potential partnerships that may lead to lasting coalitions as well” (Tepper, 2004, p. 529). The joint efforts between the Welsh and the South-Africans to promote bilingual education over the years at the IECs is an example of such partnership. Furthermore, as education was a domestic concern for dominions, and a locally managed issue in colonies as shown in Whitehead (2007), the IEC were excellent forums to showcase one’s state as a capable and responsible autonomous agent.

The IECs, including the FCE, were significant as they brought together an amalgam of educationalists in academia and government from all over the Empire/Commonwealth. One of the objectives was to learn from each other’s experiences, to inform the Board of Education at Whitehall and to gain insights from Whitehall. The second objective was to accomplish all this in the aim to facilitate greater mobility of individuals throughout the Empire/Commonwealth. These conferences were indeed fertile ground for both policy transfer and knowledge uptake as seen Tepper (2004). From an autonomist point of view, it wasn’t the meeting as such that would strengthen the bonds to keep the Empire/Commonwealth united, but the degree to which the responsible governments of member nations could benefit from the association.

Conclusion

The Imperial Conferences were important in the ongoing debate that led to the recognition of dominion autonomy. As such, they helped shape the context in which the educational conferences occurred. Far from inconsequential, the Federal Conference on Education in 1907, as well as the Imperial Education Conferences in 1911, 1923 and 1927, brought to the table a variety of parties from government and academia with a vested interest in education. In the absence of firm educational policies for the Empire, London supported the member nations who argued in favour of bilingual education in the linguistically heterogeneous areas of the Empire/Commonwealth, while keeping to a tradition of non-binding conference resolutions. On account of the non-binding character of the conference recommendations and their nature as an expression of shared experiences facilitated (not dictated) by Whitehall, agents at the local level were free to interpret them according to their political realities, without fear of anti-imperial slander. In Alberta, advocates of bilingual education could therefore go about their promotions in all legitimacy. Their actions were justifiable and compliant with London, despite being in some degree contrary to a host of differently imperial-minded English-speaking Canadians as portrayed by Berger (1970/2013), Betcherman (2002), Cook (1963), Cook and Macrae (1965), and MacFarlane (1999).

Chapter 6: The IECs, the ICs and the Local Press

Despite the groundbreaking recommendations in bilingual education in 1923, the Imperial Education Conferences (IECs) did not capture the attention of newspapers in Edmonton, Alberta's capital, as did the Imperial Conferences (ICs). In this chapter, a brief survey of the general characteristics of the IC coverage will be presented as well as a closer review of media coverage at the time of the IECs in 1907, 1911, 1923 and 1927 to see how these conferences and bilingual education were portrayed in the newspapers. As this press review will be limited to certain newspapers, a description of these will also be presented.

General Characteristics of the ICs' Coverage in the Local Press

Laurier's eloquence and importance at the earlier ICs were acclaimed (e.g., *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, June 8 1911, p. 1). Later, the Imperial Conferences' coverage of the conference proceedings was limited, despite MacLenzie King's request for more press (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, October 10 1923, p. 1). Not much was known as shown in *The Edmonton Bulletin*'s headline: "Question of Secrets That Premier Baldwin Will Have to Disclose Is Echoed and Re-Echoed in the British Press" (October 1 1923, p. 1). *The Edmonton Journal* had secured a cable service part way through the IC that allowed it access to other articles (November 3 1923, p. 1). The summaries of 1923 IC were among the better articles (*The Edmonton Bulletin* November 9 1923, p. 1; *The Edmonton Journal*, November 13 1923, p. 10). By 1926, while the presence the ICs had increased in the newspapers, the coverage still seemed superficial with few meaning making articles during the event. The recognition of dominion autonomy in 1923 had expected to be formally established in principle in 1926 so *The Edmonton Journal* bombarded its

readership with articles from overseas, concerning daily events at the IC. Yet, even that news feed recognized “that until the ban of secrecy is removed from the proceedings . . . there will be . . . anxiety as to the . . . deliberations” (Hambleton, November 3 1926, p. 2). In 1926, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* had also complained that the purposeful control over conference information that was shared with journalists had discouraged media coverage (November 3 1926a, p. 2). The English and the French language papers showed positive reactions when dominion autonomy became official. *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*'s cover page of the November 24th, 1926 issue was emblazoned with the headlines “Les Dominions et l'Angleterre sont égaux” and “Les Dominions sont des États autonomes”.

Interestingly, topics discussed at the Imperial Education Conferences as well as the Imperial Conferences were also subjects taken up in the local media, such as wireless communications. The radio had become part of the daily living in Edmonton as of 1922, (*The Edmonton Journal*, About Us, n.d., online). The radio was also the object of discussions in 1923 at the IC and in 1927 at the IEC.

In addition to autonomy, immigration was a topic discussed at the ICs as a socio-economic issue, and while it was not discussed at the IEC directly, immigration had ramifications in bilingual education in Alberta. The victory at the Imperial Conferences in 1923 and 1926 concerning official recognition of dominion autonomy hadn't stopped Canada from accepting Britain's invitation to increase British immigration. According to Canada's Minister of Immigration, Hon. Robert Forke, there was more than enough land to accommodate the thousands of expected British families (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, November 3 1926b, p. 2). As such, immigration was a reoccurring theme in the newspapers, either in the English–Canadian perspective that favored good British

immigration or, in the French Canadian perspective, as it ultimately related to French-English bilingual schools. Whereas Berger (1970/2013) has noted that English Canadians worried about generalized immigration, they seemed favorable to British immigration, especially as it effectively reduced the French Canadians to a minority. In Ontario and the Prairie provinces, the limited French-English bilingual education that was available depended on the numbers of French-speaking students. As a result, French Canadian viewed British immigration and Imperial Conferences that promoted it as threats. Boosts to French-language immigration, however, were welcomed and promoted by the French Canadians in Alberta.

To better understand the value of the IECs and bilingual education in the Alberta context, a review of the Imperial Education Conferences in the local newspapers will be presented. While no causal effect is to be determined, the parallel discussions about the same topics taking place at the IECs and within the local newspapers are deemed noteworthy.

The Local Newspapers (1907-1927)

For the purposes of this research, the focus limited itself to the French and English language newspapers available in Edmonton between 1907 and 1927.

The English Language Newspapers

The Edmonton Bulletin was chiefly used, as it was Edmonton's oldest English language daily newspaper at that time. *The Edmonton Journal* was also used, in order to complement the portrayal of the English language news. *The Edmonton Bulletin* was a Liberal party supporting newspaper, founded by Frank Oliver and Alex Taylor in the late 19th century. *The Edmonton Journal*, founded decades later by John Macpherson, Arthur

Moore and J.W. Cunningham, promoted the Conservative Party (*The Edmonton Journal*, About Us, n.d.). While presenting an English Canadian way of life based on British institutions and values, these newspapers promoted the interests of Edmonton, Alberta, and western Canada with verve. *The Edmonton Journal* has been described as more calm in tone as compared to Oliver's outspoken *The Edmonton Bulletin*; and yet, *The Edmonton Journal* has also been described as an "enthusiastic booster" (*The Edmonton Journal*, About Us, n.d.). As boosterism seems characteristic of Alberta at this period, that description could apply to *The Edmonton Bulletin* (and the local French language press) as well.

Given that Edmonton's population had a significant number of English-speaking Christians and this was the image that the papers were portraying, the Protestant Churches' activities were well represented. The interests of public non-denominational education were also well represented. *The Edmonton Journal* in particular reflected popular culture with its attention to the growing film and automobile industries, and especially the radio as the Edmonton Journal had "launched CJCA, Alberta's first radio station on May 1, 1922" (*The Edmonton Journal*, About Us, n.d.). By the 1920s, *The Edmonton Journal* had become a daily with approximately 20 pages during the week, and even more in the Saturday editions, surpassing *The Edmonton Bulletin*'s daily 10-16 pages on average.

The French Language Newspapers

Three widely circulated French language weekly newspapers were consulted in this review: *Le Courrier de l'Ouest* and *L'Union*, based in Edmonton, Alberta, and *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, based in Prince-Albert, Saskatchewan.

Le Courrier de l'Ouest provided weekly coverage for the years 1907 and 1911, but in 1915-16, it folded due to harsh economic times. It had been a vocal supporter of the Liberal party, and owned by the Hon. Philippe Roy along with other shareholders such as the Hon. Frank Oliver and the Hon. Charles W. Cross (Société historique francophone de l'Alberta, n.d.). By 1917, *L'Union* had been established by Pierre Féguenne who had honed his skills in the newspaper business upon his arrival in Alberta from Belgium in 1904 (Féguenne, n.d., Provincial Archives of Alberta). *L'Union* thrived for just over a decade as an independent weekly newspaper before being sold to the A.C.F.A. and replaced with the A.C.F.A.'s *La Survivance* in 1928-1929.

Without the existence of another Alberta-based French language newspaper, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* was employed, to supplement the missing issues of *L'Union*, covering 1922 to 1926 inclusively, from the University of Alberta's system (Peel Prairie Provinces Collections, Bibliothèque Saint-Jean, and archives of the Campus Saint-Jean).

After WWI, the French language minority communities in western Canada typically had but one French-language newspaper per province. Many of these newspapers, such as *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, were owned by the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (O.M.I.), as opposed to party politicians or businessmen. At that time, the Oblates had a strong presence in Ontario and Québec to Alberta and B.C. As a largely French-speaking order of teaching clergy, the level of sophistication in their commentary is noticeable. According to Fr. Jean Tavernier, O.M.I. of Edmonton, the press was an important tool to show the vitality of a community as well as to help safeguard it by sounding the alarm if the people's rights were endangered (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, March 21 1923b, p. 1).

In Alberta and Saskatchewan, these newspapers followed a similar eight-twelve page format and printed some of the same articles. This has allowed a fair idea of what might have been printed in the Alberta French language paper, given the attention to Albertan French-speaking centres in the Prince-Albert based newspaper. Each paper presented different facets of the challenges of bilingual education in minority contexts. The struggle was known to all and shared with all via the French language newspapers, many of which were readily available in Edmonton at J.A. MacNeil's United Tobacco & News Limited, located at 10320 Jasper Avenue (*L'Union*, April 1 1918, p.1). This being the case, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* provided a legitimate supplement to this research.

Both papers were written for and read by the French-speaking and largely Roman Catholic communities in the Prairies, especially in Alberta and Saskatchewan. For the most part, both covered the agricultural, social, religious, and linguistic interests of the readership. *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* was careful to encourage French-English bilingual schools through the promotion of Catholic education. This is apparent in an editorial by Fr. Ubald Langlois, O.M.I., in which he stated that "Notre besogne est de nous rendre meilleurs catholiques pour devenir meilleurs Français" (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, October 20 1926, p. 1. "Français" should be understood as Francophone Canadians, not French). As an independent paper, *L'Union* was mindful of its readership and largely adopted a similar demeanour. The intertwined linguistic and religious interests percolated throughout the news coverage and those interests framed the discussions on education and Canadian patriotism.

While *L'Union* and *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* were similar, they also had some notable differences. *L'Union* could be somewhat abrasive, and by the end of the 1920s,

this would contribute to its downfall. In the writings of *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, there seems to have existed a more pronounced interest in making connections between the Francophone communities in western Canada and the greater world. Whereas *L'Union* might simply have reprinted an article from another paper, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* often tended to interpret any information received and print its own article on the subject. This demonstrated not only access to other news sources, but the ability to understand the content, whether it was in English or in French, and relate the information to its own readership.

An example of *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*'s writing style was demonstrated in the spring of 1923, when it referenced a number of British newspapers in a series of articles concerning an Imperial Parliamentary Bill, and its effects on Canadian animal exports to Britain, especially as it related to cattle (April 11, 1923, p. 2; April 25 1923a, p. 1; April 25 1923b, p. 1; May 16, 1923, p. 4). Displaying a degree of understanding of imperial politics and its effect on the Canadian western farmer's plight (cf. Betcherman, 2002), the Oblates had made sure to keep the French Canadian farmer informed of the situation. The repeated coverage of Ontario's Regulation XVII, over the years and especially in 1927 when it was abandoned, is another good example of these papers' nuanced reporting styles on the same subject in the shared aim of informing a common public.

The Coverage in the Local Newspapers in 1907 and 1911

The distinct Imperial Education Conferences (IECs) that occurred separately, on different dates from the larger Imperial Conferences (ICs), did not seem to have much prominence in the public eye in this province. Moreover, the specific sessions on bilingual education were not mentioned at all.

The FCE (1907) in the Local Press

In early May 1907, under the section entitled “Faits divers”, *Le Courrier de l'Ouest* noted Premier Rutherford was to leave shortly to attend the “conférence éducationnelle” in London, England, as Minister of Education. It was thought that he would tour Europe and be back by midsummer (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, May 2 1907, p. 6). *The Edmonton Bulletin* (May 4 1907, p. 1) reported a gala dinner given in Rutherford’s honour “by the Board of Trade previous to his departure . . . on his trip to Great Britain”. Without any reference to the Imperial Education Conference, the lengthy article highlighted many initiatives of the Rutherford government, including the proposed University of Alberta as a key element in the creation of a prosperous province. This event had been echoed in *Le Courrier de l'Ouest* and by August, the French language newspaper welcomed Rutherford home from his trip (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, August 8 1907, p. 1). In late July, *The Edmonton Bulletin* had printed an article from Winnipeg about Alberta’s Premier. Having just returned from “the recent educational conference of the empire”, Rutherford believed that “the school system of Alberta is much superior to that of the motherland” and noted that the province had a bright future with the soon to be established university, a new normal school as well as a the growing infrastructure in communications and transportation (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, July 30 1907, p. 1).

These articles seem to infer that Rutherford had used the conference as a network opportunity not only for educational purposes, but also to attract capital and immigration (see Tepper, 2004; Jann & Wegrich, 2007). Despite a government budgetary surplus in 1906, times were tough in the province: coal strikes, slow construction, and high prices greeted the newcomers to the city, many of which lived in tents while waiting to find

affordable lodgings (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, March 14 1907, p. 1; August 15 1907, p. 1; June 13 1907, p. 1).

The timing of Rutherford's trip to booster Alberta's prospects in education and in finance would have coincided with the debate on preferential trade between Britain and the dominions and colonies. The question of preference was a topic of continued discussion at the larger IC which Laurier attended and that was held at a short interval from the IEC in 1907. As part of his trip to England for the IC, Laurier had spent months in Europe, promoting Canada (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, July 25 1907b, p. 1). Rutherford had also travelled to the Continent. Even Alberta's Attorney-General C.W. Cross went to England and the Continent for health as well as travel purposes and he had found growing interest in Great Britain to invest in and to immigrate to Alberta (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, June 27 1907, p. 1; June 28 1907, p. 1).

The IEC (1911) in the Local Press

No longer Premier or Minister of Education, the Hon. A.C. Rutherford assisted the EIC in 1911 as a MLA from Alberta and he was not interviewed in the local press. Moreover, he did not attend the hastily added meeting, the session entitled "Conference on Bilingualism" (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 244).

The local newspapers did not discuss the educational conference, and they didn't reprint telegraphed articles that summarized many key points of the Imperial Conference in Education of 1911. Yet, newspapers in other parts of the empire did, such as New Zealand's *Press* (e.g., *Press*, April 27 1911, p. 7).

Instead, the local media detailed the reciprocity debate. While *The Edmonton Bulletin* highlighted Laurier and imperial preference (March 9 1911, p. 4) and autonomy

(June 21 1911, p. 1) at the IC, as did *Le Courrier de l'Ouest* (June 15 1911a, p. 4; July 13 1911, p. 4), the campaign for reciprocity in Canada dominated the news. (e.g., *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, March 9 1911, p. 1; *The Edmonton Bulletin*, May 6 1911, p. 1).

In addition to all this, the nomination of Alberta's Senator Philippe Roy as the Commissioner General of Canada in Paris was another element that helped eclipse any mention of Rutherford's attendance of the 1911 IEC in London (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest* April 27 1911, p. 1; May 4 1911, p. 1; May 11, p. 1 May 25 1911b, p. 1; June 15 1911b, p. 1; *The Edmonton Bulletin*, May 1 1911, p.1). Roy, who had lived a long time in Alberta, was known for promoting French Canadian involvement in party politics and for having denounced Henri Bourassa's misrepresentation of French Canadian prospects in western Canada (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, May 16 1907, p. 6; July 25 1907a, p. 4).

Also in the news was René Lemarchand's proposed reduced postal tariff between Canada and France that had been presented to Prime Minister Laurier and Postmaster General Lemieux (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, June 29 1911, p. 1; July 20 1911, p. 1; July 27 1911, p. 1). Lemarchand had also planned to spend the winter in France to secure investments in order to return to Edmonton in the spring of 1912 and build Lemarchand Mansion (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, May 25 1911a, p. 1).

While the press covered matters of immigration, investments as well as political appointments, the IEC and bilingual education were left out, despite an awareness of this conference by important leaders of the French Canadian communities in western Canada. Mgr Legal in Alberta and Attorney-General Turgeon in Saskatchewan were important figures in bilingual education and while they were aware of the IEC, they didn't speak of these conferences in the newspapers.

During the period spanning the 1907 and 1911 conferences, Mgr Legal was in regular contact with the Alberta government, quietly advocating Catholic and French language education. As such, Mgr Legal was aware of the Imperial Education Conferences. In 1907, at the request of Premier Rutherford, Mgr Legal had written for him a letter of introduction to the Pope as the Rutherfords had planned to visit the European Continent after the conference (Rusak, 1966, p. 44). While Laurier's visit to Rome and meeting with the Pope had attracted criticisms, Rutherford's similar visit and meeting went unnoticed in the press (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, July 11 1907, p. 4).

In addition to Mgr Legal in Alberta, there was another influential French Canadian leader who knew of the IEC. The Hon. William Ferdinand Alphonse Turgeon, Attorney-General of Saskatchewan, had been designated to attend the IEC in 1911 but had been absent throughout (Imperial Government, 1911). Around the time of the IEC and the IC, Turgeon toured Belgium where he had numerous speaking engagements to promote Canada (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, July 6 1911, p. 1). He was well known in Alberta and Saskatchewan among French-speaking communities as Alphonse Turgeon and for his engagement in the promotion of the French language in western Canada (cf. Huel, 1969/1981). In 1911, his father was a sitting senator and his brother, James Gray Turgeon, was a MLA in Alberta. As Attorney-General of Saskatchewan, Alphonse Turgeon may have viewed the IEC with suspicion, as an imperial design to meddle in provincial education matters. Had he attended the IEC in 1911, perhaps more would have been made of this conference in his addresses and in the local press. According to Lavis, Abelson, McLeod, and Gold (2002, in Tepper, 2004), face-to-face meetings tend to have

a greater impact. Although he would have received a copy of the proceedings despite his absence, a written report rarely has the same effect as discussed in Tepper (2004).

Furthermore, Hon. A. Turgeon's particular view of education legislation might have precluded any relevance of the IEC in the struggle for bilingual schools in western Canada. In some letters of correspondence with Mgr Langevin made public, Turgeon affirmed that any problems with bilingual education arising from s.136 of the School Ordinances related to misunderstandings by the school inspectors of the clause. Turgeon believed that informing people was the best solution (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, April 13 1911, p. 1). It seems then, like Laurier and Mackenzie King, Turgeon believed in the need to educate the public about policy (cf. Betcherman, 2002; MacFarlane, 1999). Given Turgeon's position that no changes in the legislation were required, there would have been no need to look for new ideas and establish partnerships of support at the IEC.

At the time of the EIC in 1911, other issues had more saliency in the press. While both *The Edmonton Bulletin* and *Le Courrier de l'Ouest* had largely ignored the FCE (1907) and the IEC (1911), that pattern would change in the future. Following WWI and renewed appreciation for second language learning in the UK within a context of social reforms sparked by Lloyd George's administration, the greater context was different by 1923.

The Coverage in Local Newspapers in 1923 and 1927

Leading up to the IEC in 1923, things were grim as the Alberta Legislature was considering how to reduce the provincial budget (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 10 1923a, p. 10). The IC was announced for the autumn and other than the item of wireless communication, its agenda foreshadowed many possible points of strain in negotiations

with other dominions and the Imperial Government (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, June 6 1923, p. 3). In the summer of 1927, the mood was jubilant and the 60th anniversary of Canada's Confederation was much celebrated (e.g., *L'Union*, July 7 1927a, p. 1; *The Edmonton Journal*, July 5 1927, p. 1). The 1926 IC still echoed in *The Edmonton Journal* as the practical implications of autonomy were becoming understood, such who would be the British representative in Canada and what would be his functions (Bailey, July 4 1927, p. 1). Moreover, the end of Regulation XVII in Ontario gave new hope for many French-speaking Canadians (*L'Union*, October 6, 1927c; November 10 1927, p. 9).

Although the IECs themselves were almost entirely ignored in the press, similar ideas to those discussed at the conferences started to appear in newspaper articles. For example, *The Edmonton Journal* acknowledged a group of visiting teachers to Edmonton from the UK in the context of a farewell tea held in their honor, without reference the EIC where teacher exchanges had been discussed (May 30 1927, p. 7). In the French language newspaper, the tendency was similar.

In 1923, however, references were made to the proceedings of an IEC for the first time. Then in 1927, a brief explanation of the IEC was presented in the English newspaper. Although these two mentions do not constitute any causal relation, they do show that the IECs, though much less publicized than the ICs, were known in Edmonton nonetheless.

The IEC (1923) in the Local Press

The English language newspapers in Edmonton covered three significant events in April-May 1923 that demonstrated how the imperial mindset and the dominion autonomist spirit filtered through seemingly non-partisan events. Moreover, the news

coverage showed the changing mentality in Great Britain towards language education and displayed a corresponding move in Canada. The French language coverage stressed the value in dominion autonomy, not for isolationist purposes but for the recognition of national minority language rights in law and in practice. The coverage in both languages further demonstrated that the topics discussed in London, England were not only interesting to those officials in imperial education conference discussions, but also interesting to a general public in the far reaches of the British Empire/Commonwealth.

In the spring of 1923, both *The Edmonton Journal* and *The Edmonton Bulletin* printed articles on the National Council of Education Convention. A two day event in Toronto, it was an “educationalists’ convention” with keynote speaker Lord Robert Cecil, a British politician who had been instrumental in shaping the League of Nations (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 7 1923, p. 17). Later that week, *The Edmonton Journal* also highlighted Lord Robert Cecil’s speech in Ottawa, in support of the League of Nations (April 10 1923b, p. 7). The participation of such a figure at the National Council of Education Convention in 1923, an important year for Canada on the question of Article X of the League, reaffirmed the Canadian position on dominion autonomy and as a respected member of the international community. This public display was evidence that dominion autonomy was not only important to Mackenzie King and Lapointe, Roy and others (e.g., *The Edmonton Journal*, October 8 1926, p. 26); it also resonated with members of a key sector of the population: those parties involved in education.

Other important speakers at the National Council of Education Convention included Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, President of the University of Alberta, as well as Sir Michael Sadler, Vice Chancellor of the University of Leeds, England. The chairman of

the session was Vincent Massey, who would later become Canada's representative in Washington, D.C. "The speakers insisted that never before had the world been so vitally interested in education" (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, April 5 1923, p. 1; April 6 1923, p. 1). In his address, Tory claimed that the true meaning of education was not for material gain but for the greater good. Sadler added that education promoted order in society, and should be understood as a stabilizing element, rather than a negatively disruptive one. These discourses pre-shadowed important achievements that would take place some months later at the session on bilingualism during the Imperial Education Conference.

Another subject of great interest at this time was the visit of Sir Robert Baden-Powell and Lady Baden-Powell. While in the city, Sir Baden-Powell presented the scouting movement not only as a way to reduce delinquency, but also as a way to strengthen the bonds of Empire: he strongly supported the idea of sending dominion scouts to England as it would be good for the boys, good for the Dominion, and good for the Empire as a whole (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 11 1923, p.1; April 16 1923, p. 11). Baden-Powell's sentiment harmonized well with the British Government's position of a healthy empire of different parts but with a common foreign policy, unlike what proposed Canada's Mackenzie King at the ICs.

Within a few months, Baden-Powell would present much the same discourse at the IEC in London, England. He would not only reference his trip to Canada, but the National Council of Education Convention in Toronto as well, but as the Toronto Conference. He would even highlight the unifying advantage of the scouting movement in a western Canadian school with a group of students of "various nationalities" who did

not speak English (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 112). Despite this, Baden-Powell would not attend the session on bilingual education.

At the following IEC in 1927, he would welcome the delegates to Gilwell Park to allow them time together in a context other than at Whitehall (Imperial Government, 1927). As mentioned in Tepper (2004, p. 532), Wolman and Page (2002) had found “personal interaction” to be important in “policy transfer”. As such, the fieldtrip to the Scouts’ headquarters would be a powerful opportunity to persuade delegates of the value of scouting in education, and perhaps promote a form of imperial loyalty and readiness.

Following the Baden-Powells’ visit in 1923, Edmonton soon welcomed Sir Micheal Sadler who, like Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, had participated at the National Council of Education in Toronto weeks earlier. His arrival was greatly anticipated as evidenced in *The Edmonton Journal*’s advertisement and article, describing him in terms of “one of England’s greatest educationalists” (April 21 1923a, p. 16; 1923b, p. 6). While in Edmonton, he reiterated on the idea of greater education as a source of greater stability (e.g., *The Edmonton Journal*, April 24 1923b, p. 8). In an address on the value of a liberal education, the Leeds University Vice-Chancellor presented mathematics, history, first language learning as well as second language learning as important subjects for everyone to learn, if at all possible. (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 25 1923, p. 6). By not specifying English but using the term “mother tongue”, Sir Michael Sadler stood inside the fully attended McDougall United Church in downtown Edmonton, and affirmed the goodness of learning in one’s first language, regardless if it was English or not, as well as learning someone else’s language too.

The message was well delivered: while English was important to learn, it wasn't the only language important to learn, nor was it important to learn English first. On the contrary, one's mother tongue was best at first. Unilingualism, then, was not essential to political stability, because education was the real basis of stability, and that could include bilingual education. Invariably true to the tradition of non-binding educational policy, Sir Sadler was respectful of the challenges of different local contexts as well the autonomist spirit and refrained from stating what education should be, but what it could be. As such, a liberal education was based on choice and this choice depended on the will, as well as the means, of the state. As discussed in Tepper (2004), timing is also important in policymaking. In a few months time, the Imperial Education Conference would not only come to similar conclusions, it would offer six clear recommendations that would help make the lofty declaration practical and applicable, wherever (and whenever) the "political realities" permitted or requested it.

In the spring of 1923, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* focused on bilingual education. At times it alluded to change. It highlighted the silence of Sir Lomer Gouin while Juge Choquette declared that for there to be a true *bonne entente* in Canada, Regulation XVII had to go (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, March 21 1923a, p. 1). Moreover, the French language newspaper printed the entire convention address of Bishop G. H. Prud'homme of Saskatchewan who emphasized the possibility of bilingual education western Canada despite the "persécution linguistique". (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, May 2 1923, p. 1). This was followed up by an article signed by Mr. Henri Bourassa in which he contended that Québec had to resist the temptation of isolating itself from the world and that westward

colonization should be encouraged regardless of the opposition from big business interests (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, May 9 1923, p. 3).

As though heeding the warning against French Canadian isolationism in Québec, the tradition of ignoring the Imperial Education Conferences was broken when *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* published a very telling article about bilingual education in relation to the IEC. Very briefly, the French-language newspaper introduced the South African representative at the Imperial Education Conference in London, Dr. Viljoen, to the Francophone communities of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The article contained a synopsis of Dr. Viljoen's explanation regarding the reasons his country had espoused bilingual education for political, social, and academic reasons. Entitled "Le Canada est en retard sur le Sud-Africain", the article questioned how such a young state had already made official bilingualism real, in law as well as in practice, whereas in Canada, the discussions had been plagued by some parties' ill will for generations (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, July 11, 1923a, p. 1). Furthermore, it wondered if there might have been a correlation between religious denomination and bilingualism. In South Africa, each party that was associated with one or the other language was believed to be largely Protestant, unlike in Canada where the French and English language speakers were further divided by religious differences and grievances.

The advances in practical bilingualism in South Africa had great potential implications Alberta. This example of a minority that had its language respected and promoted in schools and the workings of the state would have been enough to make the most serious French Canadian hopeful and the most open minded Canadian imperialist a little less comfortable (cf. Berger, 1970/2013). If it had happened in South Africa and in

Wales, without blowing the Empire asunder, it might happen in Alberta, despite the religious differences.

Le Patriote de l'Ouest followed up its article concerning bilingual education at the Imperial Education Conference, with another about the value of the cinema in education. Once again, the paper summarily familiarized its Francophone readers with the Imperial Education Conference and another delegate, Mr. Frank Tate from Australia who was concerned about the American cinematic industry's negative effect on the value of film in education. As such Mr. Tate asked the conference to create a board that would explore the possibility of integrating quality films into classroom learning. "Le cinéma peut servir à l'école" was not only a headline, it was the expression of awareness of a new pedagogical tool that would be coming to schools throughout the Empire (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, July 18, 1923, p. 2).

In 1923, the Congregation of Oblates of Mary Immaculate (O.M.I.), facilitated the *École de pédagogie*, precursor to the University of Ottawa's French language Normal School in 1927, and the future Faculty of Education in 1967 (Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa/Université d'Ottawa, 2017, online; *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, March 21 1923c, p. 4; March 28 1923, p. 1). They had a marked interest in cameras and modern technology, as evidenced by their own photographic records located at the Provincial Archives of Alberta. Therefore, pedagogy and technology were of great interest and they would have been aware of the usefulness of incorporating modern devices in education.

At that time, Alberta already had a provincial censorship bureau for moving pictures. By the 1930s, films from the United States, Great Britain, and France were viewed in Alberta (Department of the Provincial Secretary of the Province of Alberta,

1934[?], p. 12). In addition to films for entertainment, educational films were also well appreciated in this province. Since 1912 when the University of Alberta's Faculty of Extension had started out with a mobile library, it had in fourteen years accumulated an impressive collection of books as well as "1,200 movie picture films and 400 sets of lantern slides" (*The Gateway*, October 14 1926, p.1). Stephenson (2010) reported that by 1911, the Colonial Office's Visual Instruction Committee had created a number of lantern slides to promote a better knowledge of all parts of the British Empire in all parts of the Empire.

In 1923, both *The Edmonton Journal* and *Le Partiot de l'Ouest* had reported about the desirability of second language education and the importance of learning in one's first language, just like what had been discussed at the Imperial Education Conference.

The IEC (1927) in the Local Press

In the spring 1927, *The Edmonton Journal* acknowledged the upcoming IEC that summer: in a short article, it summarized the purpose of the conference (April 6 1927, p. 1). Unfortunately, neither it nor *L'Union* seem to have followed up on the conference deliberations that occurred concurrently with Dominion Day celebrations and the 60th anniversary of Canadian Confederation. Nevertheless, the EIC's discussions in 1927 about bilingualism in even broader terms than in 1923, and the potential for radio in education and in communications, appear to have echoed throughout the local papers' news coverage, even as the dominion was taken up in festivities.

As at the IEC that promoted bilingual education in the vernacular, the value of teaching immigrant students in their mother tongue was promoted by an independent

MLA in the Manitoba legislature in the spring of 1927 (*The Edmonton Journal*, March 16 1927, p. 2). Short of learning in their L1, Hungarian children in western Canada were reportedly learning French and English at school (*The Edmonton Journal*, July 30 1927b, p. 5). That in itself demonstrated a move away from the rigid unilingual mindset.

Attitudes in the English language press towards second language teaching and French language teaching in particular seemed to have evolved. Much like in the Leathes Report (1918) in the UK, there was talk of simplifying Alberta's curriculum and allocating more hours to French study (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 20 1927, p. 15). In central Canada, the Ferguson and Taschereau governments were more collaborative than combative, as Regulation XVII became history (cf. Betcherman, 2002; MacFarlane, 1999). This collaboration was demonstrated when the Department of Education of Ontario organized a French Oral course in Québec to provide their teachers an authentic immersive language experience: close to 100 of them took part in this new initiative (*The Edmonton Journal*, July 27 1927, p. 7; *L'Union*, May 26 1927, p. 1). This reflected well the ideas of the recommendation for bilingual teachers at the 1923 IEC.

Bilingualism for travel and kinship was the motivation that brought a tour group from the Université de Montréal to Edmonton, where it was greeted at the train station by Mayor Bury, and the President of the University of Alberta, Dr. Henry Marshall Tory (*The Edmonton Journal*, July 25 1927, p. 10). Their arrival had coincided with the ACFA convention where educational facilities and laws had been debated in relation to bilingual education (*The Edmonton Journal*, July 25 1927, p. 10). At the convention banquet, Mayor Bury made a short welcoming address, partly in French; the Hon. Athanase David, Minister of Public Instruction of Québec, as well as Dr. W.A.R. Kerr of the University of

Albert both made speeches in French promoting bilingualism in Canada and closer interprovincial bonds (*L'Union*, July 28 1927, pp. 1, 8).

All these public manifestations of support for bilingual education and goodwill between linguistic groups were significant as they occurred in a period when the understood value of bilingual education from the IEC in 1923 was being extended in discussions at the 1927 IEC. Furthermore, these manifestations were all the more solemn given that they occurred in the context of the 60th anniversary of Confederation, the first such anniversary since the Balfour Declaration at the IC of 1926 and the recognition of dominion autonomy. While no causal relationship can be established it is important nevertheless to take note of the timing of this new development (Tepper, 2004).

The celebrations of Dominion Day seemed to provide optimism for bilingualism in the future. This optimism was made even more apparent when the “Postmaster General P. J. Veniot” . . . “issued a set of six bi-lingual postage stamps” on the occasion of the Dominion’s Diamond Jubilee and readily available in Edmonton (*The Edmonton Journal*, July 4 1927, p. 1). These were the first bilingual stamps in Canada and had been anxiously anticipated in Alberta as indicated by *L'Union*. In the upper left hand corner of the cover page of many editions of *L'Union* during 1927 there appeared the question “Pourquoi pas un timbre bilingue dans un Canada bilingue?” This continued until mid-October 1928, when the question was slightly modified to read: “Quand aurons-nous un timbre-poste bilingue dans notre Canada bilingue?” As mentioned in Betchetman (2002, p. 158), the Postmaster General P. J. Veniot had taken it upon himself to continue “to issue bilingual stamps into 1928 and 1929”, despite Mackenzie King’s reticence. It would seem that *L'Union* had taken it upon itself to make its readership take notice and

demand for this practice to continue. The discussion must have been interesting at the the Macdonald Hotel in Edmonton where was held the French Canadian luncheon in honor of the Hon. P. J. Veniot, that also coincided with Henri Bourassa's visit to the city October 8th to 10th (*L'Union*, October 6 1927a, p. 1; October 6 1927b, p. 1).

As if signaling the end of era and the start of a new, more autonomous one, Dominion Day celebrations in 1927 were made even more special by the integration of the radio. Outside on the Legislature grounds, speakers had been attached to the radio in order to allow everyone to hear the bilingual address from Ottawa by the Governor General, Lord Willingdon. According to *L'Union*,

L'énorme foule put constater, très nettement que le français est langue officielle, même en Alberta. Car on y entendait autant de français que d'anglais. Non, vraiment l'esprit de la Confédération n'est pas mort au Canada.

(July 7 1927a, p.1)

Unlike the cinema or lantern slides, radio was a technology that could reach people on the Legislature grounds or in the privacy of their homes. At the time of the Imperial Education Conference in 1923, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* had printed an article that explained how radio held immense potential for practical applications (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, July 11, 1923b, p. 7). Without referencing the Imperial Conference, *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* had nevertheless discussed the same subject as the IEC and in the same light.

In 1927, the British Broadcasting Corporation (B.B.C.) demonstrated the use of radio at the Imperial Education Conference (Imperial Government, 1927, p.79-80). The potential for radio in education had attracted much attention at the IEC. Weeks after the closing of the Imperial Education Conference, the news of Great Britain's impending

radio connection to Canada, Australia, South Africa and India was highlighted in *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* (August 31 1927b, p. 3). Again, although no reference was made to the conference in that article, it showed a clear awareness of the conference discussions as well as of the potential of the wireless broadcast as a practical way to nurture the ties between Great Britain and the far reaches of the Empire in transition.

In addition, the Canadian National Railways (C.N.R.) had announced earlier that year, plans for a monthly one hour French language-show to be broadcasted from the C.N.R.W. station in Winnipeg, Manitoba for the enjoyment of all French-language communities out West (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, February 2 1927, p. 8). The University of Alberta also presented French language programs, such as recitals and plays “à tous les gens de langue française de l'Ouest” (*L'Union*, April 7 1927, p. 1). This was welcomed news to all advocates of the French language throughout Canada. Just as the radio could strengthen ties among points of the Empire/ Commonwealth, so could it strengthen the ties among people across (western) Canada, in English and in French.

For information, for entertainment and for education purposes, the radio had proven itself to be most useful. At the IEC in 1927, the involvement of the BBC promised to make the radio even more practical in education, as well as potentially create stronger imperial attachment. In contrast, given the increased displays of bilingualism throughout 1927, however, the radio could also become an effective means to promote the French language and unite bilingual Canadians across distances throughout the dominion.

Conclusion

The FCE/IECs were not very visible in the local press coverage in Edmonton. In 1907, the FCE was portrayed in the media as an opportunity to raise the provincial profile in the British Empire and throughout Europe. In 1911, the IEC was not even acknowledged, either in the press or by the leaders in the French Canadian community in Alberta and Saskatchewan. French Canadians and English Canadians engaged in promoting their own vision of Canadian society, as a unilingual English-speaking dominion or as a bilingual dominion where English and French were spoken.

As of 1907, incremental advancements towards dominion autonomy along with the experiences of WWI and education reforms in the UK helped shape the conversation around bilingualism. By 1923, English Canadians had become more open to second language education and the French language press introduced the IEC to its readership. In 1927, the English language media acknowledged the IEC and bilingualism was well portrayed in the local newspapers. Over the years, in tandem with the successive conferences on education, there appears to have been a change in local attitudes towards bilingualism in the local newspapers, despite the FCE/IEC's lack of coverage.

Chapter 7: Silent Government Reports and Absent Agents-General

The Federal Conference on Education and the Imperial Education Conferences not only received very little mention in newspapers available in Edmonton, they went relatively unmentioned in the provincial government reports, despite official provincial participation. Moreover, whereas some state delegations to these conferences included Agents-General, Alberta's Agents-General never represented the province at any of these conferences.

The FCE/IECs in Provincial Government Reports

The relative absence of reference to any of the Imperial Education Conferences (IECs) of 1907, 1911, 1923 and 1927, and their discussions pertaining to bilingual education, was not limited to the local provincial press. Even the period reports of Alberta's Department of Education or those of the Provincial Secretary are silent in regard to these international conferences on education. This was unexpected as education was a priority for this province's early governments. The Hon. A. C. Rutherford, Premier and Minister of Education, devoted much energy to ensuring the establishment of a quality system of primary, secondary and post-secondary education. The absence, then, of any reference to the Federal Conference on Education (FCE) or the IECs in government reports becomes troubling, especially when faced with the fact that Alberta had been directly engaged in a number of these conferences.

According to the listing of conference participants in the published conference proceedings, Alberta had repeatedly sent official representation within the Dominion of Canada delegation at these London meetings. Yet, this participation was not clearly acknowledged in the province's Department of Education reports, nor was it found in the

reports of the Provincial Secretary of the period. Whereas the printing of the report of the IEC of 1923 seems to have been delayed three years, all other IEC reports were published within months of the conferences and would have been available for inclusion or at least reference within provincial reports.

Immigration, on the other hand, was mentioned in Department of Education reports. Furthermore, this was one aspect of Canadian autonomy and identity that was susceptible to British influence. It was a delicate question, whether it be in regard to British teachers in Canadian schools, or the resettlement of families from Great Britain, or the arrival of British young men as agricultural help who might stay on and become farmers in turn. British immigration had been a thorny question since the early 1900s that had bridged the ICs, the IECs (indirectly through university entrance requirements, or teacher qualifications) and the Imperial Conferences of University Students (meetings of university student representatives from across the British Empire). In Alberta's school inspectors' reports, there was often praise of British teachers, but occasionally criticism as well. However, it would have been difficult to say too much against the idea under Premier Rutherford's tenure as Minister of Education.

While in London for the FCE in 1907, Rutherford had been invited to discuss educational matters with the English Board of Education and Scottish Department of Education (Board of Education and Scotch Education Department, 1907). The then premier was afterward invited to join the Representative Council of the League of Empire that was tasked with "further work as may be approved by the departments" (League of the Empire, 1907). The report by D. S. MacKenzie, Deputy Minister of Education, for the 1909 year makes the following reference: "The department is greatly indebted to the

officials of the English and Scotch Boards of Education at Whitehall . . . for the care with which the qualifications and suitability of applicants have been considered and reported; and by means of a system of careful selection of teachers from Britain's surplus, the dearth of teachers in this province should gradually disappear (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1910, p. 14). Moreover, Mrs. Ord Marshall, the League of the Empire's Hon. Secretary, had then come to Edmonton to discuss plans for bringing boys from Great Britain to work on farms in this province. Dr. Tory, president of the University of Alberta, and Deputy Minister of Education D.S. MacKenzie were present at the meeting where it was resolved to "approve of the scheme of assisting the immigration of middle class boys, as outlined by Mrs. Ord Marshall" (League of the Empire, 1908[?], p.7).

Given the evidence of Premier Rutherford's close association with the Board of Education (U.K.), Scotland's Department of Education and the League of the Empire found in Rutherford's papers in the University of Alberta archives, the lack of any official account of participation by Alberta officials in Imperial Education Conferences remains a mystery.

The FCE/IECs and Alberta's Three Agents-General

The lack of acknowledgment of these educational conferences in the provincial government documents is made more peculiar when, in addition, it is known that intermittently during this twenty-year period (1907 - 1927), the province had a London-based official representative, the Agent-General of Alberta. As an official representative of the province in London, it was this person's responsibility to act as a direct liaison between the hub of the Empire and the far-away developing province of Alberta, in the

western reaches of the Dominion of Canada. This position seemed to have been relatively well known even in the greater Canadian public, as suggested by the mention of the Agents-General representing Ontario, Nova Scotia and British Columbia as invited guests to the wedding of the Duke of York (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 26 1923, p. 1)

The earliest reference to an Agent-General of Alberta was found in Rutherford's papers in the University of Alberta archives. In a communication to Premier Rutherford, dated July 3rd, 1909, J.H. Dunn accepted his nomination to the position and in closing asked the Premier to transmit "my kind regards to His Excellency Governor Bulyea and to my friend Mr. Cross" who was Attorney-General for Alberta (Dunn, 1909a, p. 2). Already established in London at his office at 41 Threadneedle Street, Dunn was a well-known and successful financier with close contact to many of the Empire's finest, including Lord Beaverbrook, Dunn's childhood friend Max Aitken. A lawyer like A.C. Rutherford, J.H. Dunn had also practiced law in Edmonton, before getting established in Montréal and then London (McDowell, 2013). Dunn was therefore acquainted with the Alberta context and in a favourable position to promote the province's potential. In his acceptance letter from London, England, Dunn stated that he would "take pride in forwarding in every way that lies in my power the interests of Alberta in this country", before immediately getting to work and informing the Premier of the importance of establishing the province's financial credit in England (Dunn, 1909a, p. 1).

It would seem that Agent-General Dunn was quick to recognize an opportunity to promote the province's interests. Among Rutherford's papers of the University of Alberta Archives is a telegram from Dunn, dated September 8th, 1909, just a few months after his nomination. In it, Dunn alerted Rutherford to the imminent arrival in Edmonton of Lord

Northcliffe and his party. Dunn also suggested the Premier meet the party that included none other than “Moberly Bell, Editor of *London Times*”, as it was written in the telegram (Dunn, 1909b). Unfortunately, no further evidence was found of Dunn’s proposed meeting with Moberly Bell, *The Times*’ editor, or the newspaper’s proprietor, Alfred Harmsworth, the Lord Northcliffe.

Rutherford would have realized the opportunity to become known to the Harmsworth brothers: press magnates, businessmen and even a British Liberal MP. Later, upon leaving the British Parliament, Leicester Harmsworth donated to the Canadian government a series of historically significant documents from the time of the British Conquest, including papers that had belonged to General Wolfe (*Le Patriote de l’Ouest*, October 24 1923, p. 5). Moreover, given the importance of *The Times* as a window unto the world as much as a window of the world unto Alberta, it is likely that Premier Rutherford heeded Agent-General Dunn’s suggestion and made time for Lord Northcliffe and his party. This likelihood is supported by the evidence of a correspondence between A. C. Rutherford and Howard Angus Kennedy over the course of the next three years (Kennedy, 1909; Rutherford, 1912). During that period, Howard Angus Kennedy was the Canadian correspondent of *The Times*.

The Times of London was, and has remained, a leading British paper, and the bookish and imperially minded Premier Rutherford would have been familiar with it. The library in the Alberta Legislature building held a continuous subscription to this paper from the earliest days of 20th century and for several decades afterwards (Legislature of Alberta Library, 1924). According to the *Report of the Provincial Librarian to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, for the year ending December 31, 1907*, the Alberta

Legislature Library received a host of Canadian, American as well as English newspapers, including *The Times* (Legislature of Alberta Library, 1907). By the 1930s, these numbers had dwindled but the one English newspaper that was still received remained *The Times* (Legislature Of Alberta Library, 1931). As such, no matter the economic state of the province, the Premier and everyone with access to the Alberta Legislature library would likely have been acquainted with *The Times of London* and been aware of anything of British, or Canadian consequence in its pages.

Within Dunn's first year as Agent-General for Alberta, articles were published in *The Times* detailing the bilingual school question in Canada as it evolved in Ontario with the Merchant Report, Bishop Fallon, Henri Bourrassa, and Regulation XVII. Between October 1910 and May 1916, there were at least six articles about the situation surrounding bilingual education in Ontario, of which five appeared between 1910 and 1913. Another pair followed in 1923 and in 1926. As such, Ontario's intestinal disputes were taking place very publicly, from the outset. With the entire Empire and beyond as its readership, the power of portrayal by *The Times* had evidently not been lost on Agent-General Dunn, as evidenced by his telegram to Rutherford to meet with Moberly Bell in 1909.

However, J.H. Dunn was soon engrossed in a complex European financing operation with Ontario interests (Naastad Strøm, 2012). Therefore, from 1913 until 1918, Alberta's Agent-General was J.A. Reid, according to a letter and certified copy of an Order-in-Council signed by the clerk of the Executive Council of the Province of Alberta, Donald Baker, and found in a scrapbook of Mrs. Mabel Reid, née Laurie (Baker, 1913, p. 28; Executive Council, 1913, p. 29). From what was found in the Jessie DeGear Fonds at

the Glenbow Museum Archives, it appears the Reids received invitations to many, if not all, of the most important social and official events. The invitations by the League of the Empire to an annual meeting of the Teachers' Associations of the British Empire, as well as to the reception that followed are of note as they allowed "the Agent-General of Alberta, Mr. J. Reid, to meet Representatives of the Imperial Union of Teachers," "and Visitors from His Majesty's Overseas Dominions" (League of Empire, 1915a, p. 40; League of Empire, 1915b, p. 131). These socio-political interactions indicated recognition by the imperial chain of command of the official presence of the Alberta government in London, England, as well as Alberta's familiarity with the imperial chain of command in matters pertaining to education throughout the Empire.

By the late 1920s, the office of Alberta's Agent-General was perfectly skilled at recruiting and relocating to Alberta various interested parties (*The Calgary Albertan*, March 2 1928, n.p.). Herbert Greenfield had been born in England and come to Alberta after first spending some time in Ontario. Following a tumultuous tenure as Premier and leader of the United Farmers of Alberta party (U.F.A.) in the early 1920s, Herbert Greenfield served the province as Agent-General as of 1927. *The Edmonton Journal* reported that as Alberta's representative in London, Greenfield was responsible for convincing the British to invest in the province and as such, he was "working hard for Alberta" (April 6 1927, p. 6; April 27 1927, p. 13). It was said that Greenfield's gracious and genial personality, combined with his love for and knowledge of the province, facilitated his efforts to promote British investment in and immigration to Alberta, as well as promote Albertan interests in Great Britain (Jones, 2004, p. 73; Foster, 2004, p. 86).

Given the evident important practical benefit provided by an Agent-General in London, it is not surprising that Alberta was not the only province or state in the Empire to avail itself of an Agent-General. As concluded Jann and Wegrich (2007), even appointed officials have a part to play in the policy process. What is surprising is that, unlike other Agents-General, Alberta's official in London was never included on the delegate lists of the Imperial Education Conferences. Stephenson (2010) remarked that Australia alone had had six Agents-General as part of its delegation in 1907.

Within the delegation lists of various Imperial Education Conferences, Agents-General representing Natal and various Australian states are readily identified. British Columbia's Agent-General, also a vice-president of the League of Empire, accompanied other Canadian officials to the Federal Conference on Education in 1907. In 1911 and 1923, the Canadian delegations did not include any Agents-General at the conferences. In 1927 however, Nova Scotia, Québec, Ontario and British Columbia had Agent-General representation that, in addition to other officials from Ontario, Québec and Nova Scotia, composed the conference delegation representing Canada. Not only then was there no Agent-General representation for Alberta at these Imperial Education Conferences – there is scarcely any record in the Alberta Legislature Library, the Provincial Archives of Alberta, the University of Alberta Libraries and Archives, or the Glenbow Museum Archives pertaining to the existence of an Agent-General for Alberta during the first half of the 20th century.

Conclusion

Official records of the government of Alberta did not include references to the FCE in 1907 or any of the IECs thereafter, despite official provincial representation at two of these conferences. Moreover, the province was never represented at the FCE/IECs by an Agent-General, contrary to many other Canadian provinces or various states of the British Empire/Commonwealth. The series of weeklong London-based Federal Conference on Education and Imperial Education Conferences held between 1907 and 1927 were nevertheless important events. In the following section, we will explore what was discussed at these conferences and what occurred in Alberta, not only in terms of general education endeavours, but specifically in regard to this province's provisions for bilingual French-English education as well.

Chapter 8: The FCE (1907) and the IEC (1911)

In the opening decade of the 20th century, Alberta was a young Canadian province with a great future. According to the vision of the Hon. A. C. Rutherford, the key to this future was a complete education system that would ensure the nascent state's prosperity and stability. From what was mentioned in the provincial press, these conference trips seemed more like trade missions. However, a survey of the conference reports and other readings such as Rusak (1966) make clear that Rutherford took these conferences and the contacts that he made here very seriously in order to build a strong provincial educational system.

The Federal Conference on Education (1907)

A. C. Rutherford attended this conference as Premier of Alberta and Minister of Education; and he represented both Alberta and Saskatchewan (Federal Council of the League of the Empire, 1907, p. 8). Upon his return, Rutherford was anxious to make Alberta's education system on par with the standards discussed at the Federal Conference on Education (FCE), at all levels of formal schooling, including the post-secondary. Although the conference's discussions on textbooks and universities were topics that were strongly championed by Rutherford back home, it should be noted that the conference's resolution on bilingual education bore a similarity to the educational policy already in place in Alberta since 1901, as will be discussed later.

The London-Alberta Connection Strengthened via Textbooks and Education

Rutherford arrived in London in 1907, looking to improve his province's educational system, in the aim of crowning it with a university (Rusak, 1966, p. 34). The University Act of 1906 prepared the way for the establishment of the University of

Alberta within a few years. However, a first-rate primary and secondary education system was required to support such a lofty post-secondary enterprise. An avid reader himself with an immense personal library, Rutherford understood the importance of early and sustained literacy in education. As Premier of a new province, with a heterogeneous population comprised of various clusters, separated by language and religious customs, as much as by distances, Rutherford was also faced with the challenges of educating the diverse population of Alberta.

Among the matters debated at the FCE, the question of uniform and modern textbooks for students across the Empire had received much attention. In spite of the general acknowledgement at the conference that uniform textbooks would be impractical given the host of various local conditions in 1907, it was agreed at the conference that the Office of Special Inquiries in London, England, would assist colonial governments in choosing and procuring their book renewals (Imperial Government, 1911, pp. 30, 31). This is another example of Whitehead's (2007) claim about the British tradition of flexible educational policies. It was further decided that a common understanding of expectations and a clear definition of terminology employed throughout the Empire was crucial (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 30). Unfortunately, while this general statement of intent met with everyone's approval, it wasn't mentioned again and was forgotten; such as is likely to happen when conference statements are too vague, such as explained in Tepper (2004). By the following conference in 1911, it was reported that the Office of Special Inquiries had already enabled the government of Alberta, the only imperial member to have engaged in this program of assistance, to procure the appropriate textbooks (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 31). As stated in a period handbook for

teachers, the new 1908 textbooks were the *Alexandra Readers*, named after King Edward VII's Queen Consort (Government of Alberta[?], 1914) . Incidentally, the McDougall's Educational Company of London had advertised the series as the very best collection of literature for schools (Federal Council of the League of the Empire, 1907, p. vi of the Advertisements).

Prior to the FCE, Bishop Legal had tried to present the Premier with some possibilities for another more inclusive history book for Catholic students in Alberta, but to no avail. Bishop Legal would redouble his efforts in 1909-1910 to allow Catholic students in Alberta to have the same English history books used by Catholic students in the United-States and Ontario, but Rutherford refused the request (Rusak, 1966, pp. 47-48). As the chief authority in Albertan education, Premier and Minister of Education Rutherford set the tone for education expectations, just as Whitehead (2007) had argued in the case of British overseas education throughout the Empire. Rutherford's refusal of Legal's request stood in contrast of the FCE's rejection of the common book concept on account of local sensibilities and differences. This refusal would also remain significant twenty years later when, at the Imperial Education Conference of 1927, a revision of British history course with an updated reading list would be applauded because of the recognition of the contributions of all groups under the Union Jack.

In 1907, Premier Rutherford was driven to establish one common curriculum throughout the province regardless of religious affinity. In this he was similar to most government officials in English-speaking Canada who supported the ideal to have all Canadians live a similar experience in their formative years at school throughout the Dominion of Canada (cf. Gidney and Millar, 2012; Sutherland, 2000). Rutherford

however was determined to provide the same non-sectarian readers for all students across at least two western provinces in order to also facilitate greater project collaboration and information exchange with the League of the Empire. In terms of policymaking, it would appear that Rutherford had hoped to use the Imperial Education Conference (1907) as an opportunity “to shore up support for a pet project . . . with outside validation” such as described in Tepper (2004, p. 531). The Rutherford papers in the University of Alberta archives show he was committed to establish a close and comfortable relationship with the Board of Education in England and the Scottish Department of Education. This commitment was the foundation of the highly descriptive annual reports of the Department of Education of the province of Alberta. The efforts of the Department of Education reflected Rutherford’s interpretation of the 1907 conference discussion about “closer uniformity of curricula, nomenclature, and methods” (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 30). For Rutherford, these books were part and parcel of the strategy to inculcate a strong attachment to British institutions and values, and in that sense, they upheld the direction agreed upon at the Federal Conference on Education in 1907.

That Alberta was the only state mentioned to have afforded itself of the Office of Special Inquiries’ services bears witness to the provincial government’s acute awareness of and engagement in educational discussions overseas. Moreover, this mention demonstrated the eagerness of Premier Rutherford to establish a recognized education system in the province, on par with London-approved standards. Whether or not he genuinely espoused a sense of Canadian imperialism as described in Berger (1970/2013), Rutherford may have used the Imperial Education Conferences, that were both timely and carried London’s endorsement, to further his province-building ambition. In addition, and

perhaps more importantly, the conference report indicated that England was watching and taking note of business, even in seemingly remote corners of the Empire. It appears then, that from the beginning, these imperial encounters were also accountability measures of sorts and that the province of Alberta was keen to participate in and benefit from this system. Given the Alberta government's ambition to create a most prosperous and united Anglo-dominant society based on quality education and attachment to British institutions, such public recognition of Alberta in the Reports of the Imperial Conferences might be even more significant than whether or not the Imperial Education Conferences were acknowledged in the province.

Bilingual Education Discussed at the FCE (1907)

Another topic of discussion at the 1907 meeting had been bilingual education. Indeed, the roundtable exchange included representatives of different bilingual areas within the Empire, but Rutherford was not in attendance.

Among the presentations made at this meeting was the paper by a French speaker referred to as "Monsieur" Adolphe Bernon, the Inspector of Schools in Mauritius. His presentation was entitled "The Teaching of English to non-English Speaking Children in the Colonies" (Federal Council of the League of the Empire, 1907, p. 334). Using an example from Wales and his own experience in Mauritius, he proposed that the best way to educate non-English speaking children in English-speaking schools was by combining the direct method with translation. This combined approach allowed the use of the students' knowledge and communicative abilities in their first language as a foundation on which to add new knowledge and communicative skills in English.

In the course of the discussion that followed this presentation, the Honourable Secretary for this section of the conference, Mr. Ernest Young, B.Sc., emphasized that the use of the students' first language was instrumental in the teaching of their second language. As such, the following resolution by Monsieur Adolphe Bernon was adopted unanimously: "That in the teaching of living languages the direct system be used, and now and then an explanation in the mother-tongue of the pupil when it is evident that the latter has not understood the teacher" (Federal Council of the League of the Empire, 1907, p. 335). It was one of the last resolutions passed before the end of the final conference meeting and the only one addressing bilingual education.

It is interesting to note that the resolution on bilingual education reflected, in part, what had already been established in Alberta, six years earlier in the Northwest Territories School Ordinance of 1901 and carried over in 1905 to apply to the newly created province of Alberta. This example demonstrates how little room there is for policy innovation and how a new policy may be a modified version of a pre-existing policy, according to Hogwood and Peters (1983), as discussed in Jann and Wegrich (2007). In Alberta, French (or any other language) could be used in school when English was not understood. However, whereas this allowance for bilingual education was limited in Alberta to the first years of primary school, and subject to a fee, the London resolution remained open ended and without mention of any fees. While the absence of fees was different than usual practice in British overseas educational policy, the non-binding nature of the recommendation fitted well with the established practice (Whitehead, 2007).

The Coverage of the FCE (1907) in *The Times*

Regrettably, nothing was found in *The Times* about the FCE in 1907. However, between 1905 and 1909, the newspaper did showcase the matter of bilingual education such as discussed at the conference as they occurred in some of the different areas of the English-speaking world: Wales, Ireland and South Africa. Coincidentally, these were also states in different situations that desired more autonomy within the British system. By featuring these examples, *The Times* performed a series of political evaluations of different approaches to bilingual education, and as such, informed the ongoing educational policy discussions concerning bilingualism, as indicated in Jann and Wegrich (2007). Moreover, through the separate reports on the condition of bilingual education in three different contexts, *The Times* also managed to keep the topic of bilingual education alive and circulating within “the policy primordial soup” of different ideas in between Imperial Education Conferences (Tepper, 2004, p. 529).

Entitled “The Teaching of Welsh”, this early article provided a fair understanding of two systems of language teaching at work, concluding that when the results were compared, one system seemed rather questionable. In both cases, the students in Wales would have gone to school for the first two years in Welsh and the introduction of English would have occurred afterwards, but in different proportions. When compared to schools spending half the school hours in each Welsh and English, to those where only two to six hours a week were used for Welsh learning, the article concluded that the latter system provided “doubtful” Welsh language skills (*The Times*, April 22 1905, p. 10). Yet, in Alberta as indeed elsewhere east of the province, French language teaching was at best in line with what had been dubbed “doubtful” in *The Times’* article. It should be

remembered that bilingual education at that time in this province was limited to communities with significant Francophone populations. The French language primary course only covered the first two years of school; any education given in a language other than English could not interfere with the rest of the curriculum; and such instruction was subject to a fee, according to s.136 of the School Ordinance (1901).

In 1906, *The Times* published the proceedings of a House of Commons exchange (in London) that provided an update of the “Bilingual Programme for Schools in Irish-speaking Districts”. The person responsible explained the plan as an incentive-based grant model that not only rewarded the school, but the students and teacher as well. In addition to financial rewards and organized evening classes, the teachers could receive assistance to attend summer courses in order to become more proficient in Gaelic. This system was thought to produce better results in Irish language teaching than past efforts. When another member of the House asked if this scheme “was not intended to promote sedition,” the person responsible for the program replied that “he was surprised that anybody who knew anything about the matter should put such a question” (*The Times*, May 29 1906, p. 10). Therefore, as early as 1906, increased teacher education was seen as a key element to ensure better results in bilingual programs. This was not only to become a central tenant of Dr. Merchant’s 1912 findings in Ontario, and reported as such on page 5 of *The Times* March 8th of that same year, but it would become enshrined as one of the recommendations for bilingual education at the Imperial Education Conference in 1923. As for the financial incentive, it was an idea that would find its way back into educational policy after WWI in another context, that of keeping good teachers in rural schools, both in the UK and in Alberta.

The last article presented the lesson to be learned in the aftermath of the Boer Wars and the establishment of official bilingualism in law and in practice in South Africa. As somewhat of a cautionary tale, “The South African Constitution” was an argument presented by *The Times*’ correspondent. He promoted the idea that the best way to assure a generalized knowledge and use of English in South Africa was by allowing Dutch the same respect. Insistence on a preference for English was labeled “unwise” and unnecessary as the “Dutch are a shrewd as well as a sentimental people. Deep as is their attachment to their own tongue, they recognize the practical and intellectual value of English . . .” (*The Times*, May 24 1909, p. 10). Given the parallels between this situation and that of the Métis or the French Canadians in western Canada, this article about South Africa could have as easily have been about Alberta. As it was, in 1909, this article announced a new way of thinking that contradicted Freeman’s insistence on unilingualism. True bilingualism, not assimilation, was essential to maintain a prosperous, strong, and united English-speaking society.

In sum, while nothing more of the FCE was found in *The Times* than in the newspapers in Alberta, *The Times* did display a better understanding of the issue of bilingual education within the British Empire in the same period.

The Imperial Education Conference (1911)

In the *Report of the Imperial Education Conference 1911*, it was explained that the exchange on bilingual education in 1907 had been curtailed in scope and depth, on account of the political sensitivities surrounding this issue, namely in the context of the emerging state of the Union of South Africa. Nevertheless, there had been agreement to revisit the topic at a later date. Not long before the Imperial Education Conference in

1911, the political sensibilities in question had finally been deemed less volatile, and the topic of bilingual education became a last minute addition to the schedule (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 245). As a result, bilingual education was discussed as a separate session, commencing on May 2nd, the day after the other sessions were all over. Given that, as shown in Tepper (2004), an agenda is a reflection of choices that are retained for discussion, the adaptation of the agenda to suit South Africa, both in 1907 and certainly in 1911 was informative. This act displayed both an “interest between the relevant actors” and a “capacity of the institutions in charge to act effectively” (Jann & Wegrich, 2007, p. 47). Biligualism was important enough to warrant accommodation.

Absence of Local Representation at the Bilingual Education Session

According to the *Report of the Imperial Education Conference 1911* (p. 21), the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan, the Hon. W.F.A. Turgeon, was scheduled to attend the conference. Yet, he did not attend: not even the session on bilingualism. The Hon. A. C. Rutherford, for his part, did attend the 1911 Imperial Education Conference as “Ex-Minister of Education and a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta” (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 21). Unfortunately, the lone delegate from Alberta did not stay for the session on bilingual education. It should be noted, however, that this session had been added to the agenda, without much warning and within some short weeks in advance of the conference commencement date (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 245).

Distribution of the Report of the IEC (1911)

If it may be assumed that the report of the conference likely remained unknown to the general public in Alberta, the detailed report was readily available to government officials throughout the Empire. Indeed, copies of the conference report were sent to the

official representatives expected at the conference, regardless of their attendance. Such was the case, for example, of A. H. W. Colquhoun, Deputy Minister of Education for Ontario, who had been expected to represent the Dominion of Canada along with A. C. Rutherford and others, but had failed to attend. Despite his absence, he received his copy of the report that he signed and dated in Toronto, June 30, 1911. The digitalized version of Colquhoun's signed copy was used in this research. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that A. C. Rutherford, sitting MLA for Alberta, as well as the Hon. W.F.A. Turgeon, Attorney-General of Saskatchewan, also received their copies of the complete conference proceedings and had read about the discussion surrounding bilingual education.

While the lack of public recognition might seem odd within policymaking, it isn't unknown. As discussed in Jann and Wegrich (2007, p. 46, citing May, 1991), there are "processes of policy without public input". In these cases, government agendas are influenced by interests, inside or outside government, without drawing public attention. Moreover, with regard to the session on bilingual education, no resolutions were passed, so there was no clear decision to report (cf. Tepper, 2004). These reasons, in addition to the potential of other topical issues of greater local saliency for the local newspapers' coverage, could help explain the lack of public awareness of the proceedings.

Different Views of Bilingual Education at the EIC (1911)

As it was, Canada's representation at the bilingual education session was assured by a three-person delegation: A.H. MacKay, R. Magill, as well as G. W. Parmelee. They had attended the other sessions of the conference and were all from eastern Canada. G. W. Parmelee was the Secretary of Public Instruction in Québec and published

educationalist (Parmelee, 1914). A. H. MacKay was the Superintendent of Education in Nova Scotia; and R. Magill was a professor of philosophy at Dalhousie University (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 244). Parmelee and MacKay had also represented their provinces within the Canadian delegation at the previous conference in 1907 (Federal Council of the League of the Empire, 1907).

The 1911 session on bilingual education laid the foundation for the bilingual education discussions of 1923. No resolutions pertaining to bilingual education were passed at this conference but the pointed discussion foreshadowed that a change was afoot. Interestingly, the representatives from South Africa and Wales were early champions of bilingual education within the British Empire.

Dr. Thomas Muir, a delegate from South Africa, had specified that it was his country that had asked that the discussion on bilingual education from the 1907 conference be pursued at the 1911 conference because South Africa had hoped to benefit from the experiences of others in dealing with the complexity surrounding bilingual education (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 246). Since the end of the hostilities in South Africa, one of the problems that lingered centered on the linguistic difficulties of schooling a new society where old foes were to become good neighbours. Perhaps as an indication of goodwill, South Africa remained actively engaged in these London-based education conferences. By 1911, South Africa had already been recognized as a dominion and was an active participant in both the Imperial Conferences and the Imperial Education Conferences. As it happened, at the time of the 1911 conference, South Africa was in a position to shine by example, having recently adopted in principle a national policy on bilingual education (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 247). Not only did Dr.

Viljoen, another delegate from South Africa, explain how bilingual education was organized in this new state, he repeatedly stressed the socio-political value afforded by the principle of bilingual education. For Viljoen, bilingualism allowed better understanding and respect, especially between South Africans of British and Dutch descent, in order to build a prosperous and just society.

Whereas the representatives from Wales and South Africa obviously viewed bilingual education with great enthusiasm, Canada seemed to view bilingual education with less enthusiasm. The difference in perception was abundantly clear when comparing the discourses of the representatives of Wales and Québec. Mr. Parmelee of Québec concluded that languages were nothing more but mediums of communication and that bilingualism, while necessary to some degree in Québec, represented no advantage in itself (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 254). This position reflected that of Canadian imperialists who strongly believed, like Professor Freeman, that unity was best found in unilingualism (cf. Berger, 1970/2013). The retort of Mr. Owen Edwards, Chief Inspector of Schools in Wales, displayed another view altogether when he announced that bilingualism was an asset, not a hindrance: “ We do not regard the bi-lingualism of our country as a disadvantage in any way. We look upon it as an advantage. I believe that every schoolmaster in Wales who has given his mind to the subject looks upon bi-lingualism now as his opportunity, and not as his difficulty” (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 256; Central Advisory Council for Education: Wales, 1953, p. 18). In Wales, the problem presented by bilingual education had been framed in terms of how to achieve it properly, not in terms of whether bilingual education was good or bad. Over the years, effective ways had been developed to ensure that pupils at Welsh schools not only

obtained a sound education, but strong languages skills in both Welsh and English (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 256; Central Advisory Council for Education: Wales, 1953, pp.1-18).

Given the positions expressed by Parmelee and Owens, it becomes evident that within the British Empire, there were differences of opinion about the value of a bilingual education, even when the discussion was limited to languages rooted in Europe. In addition, it also seems that schooling authorities in London, in Wales and in South Africa were in agreement to shift the course of bilingual education in a way that Canada seemed reticent to fully follow.

A Source of Early and Longstanding Rhetoric Against Bilingualism

In the United-Kingdom, bilingual education in Wales had a long history of practice that had become increasingly more formalized around the turn of the 20th century (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 256; Central Advisory Council for Education: Wales, 1953, pp. 1-18). By 1911, the Welsh success record was supporting the changing view that bilingualism might enhance rather than inhibit the development of a student's intelligence, in addition to helping the student's English language skills (Imperial Government, 1911, p. 256). Undesirable side effects of bilingualism had often been the conclusion of the leading intelligence tests of the day. However, since the mid 19th century, Welsh government intelligence tests had increasingly sought to circumvent the language factor in Wales by making use of the student's first language, and by the first half of 20th century, the legitimacy of intelligence tests in Wales rested strongly on the avoidance of the verbal issue all together (Central Advisory Council for Education: Wales, 1953, pp. 14-16, 44). The Central Advisory Council for Education: Wales (1953,

pp. 14-16, 44) did not claim any advantage for a bilingual education. However, it did refute research claims of a bilingual disadvantage, including some Welsh findings by Saer in the 1920s. The rejection of the negative claims by the Central Advisory Council for Education: Wales (1953, pp. 14-16, 44) was based on the fact that these early intelligence tests did not account for an English-language test taken by children of differing socio-economical and linguistic backgrounds.

It must be remembered that the first decades of the 1900s were a period in history where intelligence testing was popular and most American research that dominated the headlines associated bilingualism with inferior intellectual development and academic skills. As of 1910, psychometric tests had become more widespread as they were perceived as being a scientific approach to testing intelligence. Fundamentally it came down to a measure of understanding demonstrated through linguistic expression that was thought to coincide with the participant's level of intelligence. A majority of psychometric studies published in English linked mental delays to bilingualism, with few noted exceptions that typically involved Jewish children, who often performed very well. As psychometric studies appeared in well-respected journals and the incidental exceptions were minimized, these studies stood as credible support to claims for English-only education. Psychometric tests as scientific research were valuable in framing views and policy, as discussed in Jann and Wegrich (2007).

Part of the allure of the psychometric tests was their air of a scientific approach and seemingly generalizable conclusions. Prior to the modern 20th century studies on bilingualism through psychometric tests, most of the research on bilingualism had been effectuated in the 19th century on subjects who had experienced head trauma. Studies

involving monolingual and bilingual patients with brain trauma (aphasic or aphasiac studies) dated since the 1850s and were aimed at uncovering the relationship between bilingualism and brain functions pertaining to language (Genesee, 1982, p. 315; Lambert & Fillenbaum, 1959). Contrary to the aphasiac studies, psychometric test studies were conducted among the general population and focused on the perceived effect of bilingualism on academic performance as indicator of intellectual development. This allowed bilingualism studies to leave the laboratories of neuro-linguists and enter the public space, including the school, under the watchful eyes of educationalists, psychologists, and sociologists.

Out in the real world, bilingualism studies seemed to deal with ordinary people. In fact, most studies compared children from English-speaking established families to immigrant children who had had little or no schooling in the new adoptive home and consequently understood little English. Hence, even though psychometric research was done out in the open, it was still confined to specific populations and conditions. While the tests largely ignored the varying socio-economic conditions of the participants, the psychometric tests' conclusions, formulated by respected academics, lent scientific legitimacy for decades to dominating pedagogical and political traditions, especially with regards to bilingual education. This helps to understand the continued influence of Laurie (1904/1889, p. 8) who famously argued that the ability to live and play in two languages would not double the person's intellectual development but stunt it by half.

Psychometric-based research pointing to bilingualism as a source of mental deficiency also had the effect of reinforcing the social and political isolation of French Canadians who strongly clung to their language and their faith, generations after the

British conquest of New France. With the rise of psychometric testing, there was now evidence to believe that bilingual education incurred risks. Therefore, even the more open-minded Anglophone might have been discouraged to venture in such waters, especially when an all-English education was readily available and free from any association with impaired mental development. In this discouraging context, French Canadian demands for bilingual schools were ignored and Francophone students in the educational system were isolated. This created an opportunity for school inspectors to directly assert their power as agents of assimilation.

According to Rusak (1966), in 1907, Mgr Legal had denounced School Inspector Ellis' report to Premier Rutherford on account of Ellis' evaluation of the St. Albert Catholic Public School. While Legal agreed with Ellis with regards to the overcrowded conditions, he felt that the students' poor academic performance in mathematics was more indicative of the fact that "the pupils were not accustomed to Ellis' manner of questioning" and that "For children whose first language is not English it would be impossible to have perfect pronunciation. Some children in the school spoke three languages and the newest was English" (Rusak, 1966, p. 37). Legal's protests mirrored those of the small and growing body of scientific work that expressed similar concerns over the use of psychometric tests. However, the popularity of these tests drowned out the criticisms and these tests remained dominant in bilingualism studies as well as in the court of public opinion in many places.

The proclaimed association of intellectual stunting and bilingual education seemed to present tangible proof that multilingualism would be a drain on a society. As such, this claimed association sustained Freeman's "One Nation, One Language" theory

and justified Laurie's controlled exposure to additional language learning for utilitarian rather than conversational purposes. Hence, psychometric tests provided a pretence of legitimacy to the discourse of assimilation that was echoed by American leaders and government officials in Canada.

It was not until E. Peal and W. Lambert's landmark article, "The relation of bilingualism to intelligence" (1962), that the flawed psychometric studies were finally debunked. As doubts are difficult to exorcize, most of the literature in bilingualism studies since Peal and Lambert (1962), especially concerning French Immersion programs, have continued to report due diligently on the safety of bilingualism for the developing child.

In the opening decades of the 20th century, however, well before Peal and Lambert (1962), many were those who believed psychometric test findings, such as would be again made clear by some delegates at the 1923 Imperial Education Conference. Just as importantly, more and more people were already expressing concern about these intelligence tests, especially when the language factor was not accounted for. As such, the direction espoused in bilingual education by Wales and South Africa, along with London's evident support of this bilingual education enterprise, was an early indication of a major shift in the dominant thought of the period, the belief that language expression and proficiency was naturally a highly significant indicator of intelligence.

The Coverage of the IEC (1911) in *The Times*

The Times published several articles pertaining to the Imperial Education Conference in 1911. The very first article was a letter to the editor that appeared during the days that the Conference was being held. In it, the author expressed hope that the

Imperial Education Conference would enact real change in the way information about educational matters was collected and shared. The letter was a plea in favour of the establishment of a Bureau of Education that would be a central information service about the state of all Departments of Education in the Empire. It argued that France and the United States had such departments that collected information such as teaching practices and educational administration adopted in their own countries as well as what was followed elsewhere. Although there existed a Department of Special Inquiries within the Board of Education, it was unable to provide detailed and updated information about education throughout the Empire. It would appear that the efforts of Mrs. Ord Marshall and the Representative Council of the League of the Empire were not sufficient. According to the editorial, educational authorities throughout the Empire were at a disadvantage, unable to know what was going on in other lands of the Union Jack, nor even in Wales and England (*The Times*, April 25 1911, p. 4). As Whitehead (2007) has noted, the French had overarching educational policies. It is possible that the detailed character of these policies rested on an information collection bureau.

Less than a month later, *The Times* reported on all the progress that had been achieved at the IEC, such as strides in furthering the recognition of teacher qualifications, additional teaching education to be made available to teachers of the Empire, as well as the unanimous acceptance of the Imperial Education Bureau. Comprised of an eight-member board, that included representation from South Africa, Australia and Canada, this Board was to:

facilitate the exchange of information between the different Education
Departments of the Empire by the supply of all printed documents of

educational value to the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports which should construct a bibliography . . . to be issued quarterly to all Education Departments of the Empire. (*The Times*, May 17 1911, p. 7)

Moreover, the newspaper continued:

the Conference recommended that the several Education Departments of the Empire should prepare, print, and publish monographs on – (a) the curricula of schools for general education, (b) the training of teachers for schools giving general education, (c) the laws of compulsory attendance and their working, (d) the general education of children in sparsely-populated areas, and (e) the medical inspection of schools for general education. (*The Times*, May 17 1911, p. 7)

The article ended with report of what had been discussed at the session on Bilingual Education, presided by the President of the Board of Education. Not only did the article present the Canadian position at the meeting, it promised that the report of this meeting could be found in the proceedings of the Conference. This article should have been instructive for everyone with access to *The Times*. Moreover, since all Departments of Education had been required to provide official documentation to the Imperial Education Bureau and that these requirements had been made public in *The Times*, it is incomprehensible that no mention of this information sharing was found in provincial government documents. This said, the particular attention to form and detail given in the provincial Department of Education's annual reports becomes more understandable, given that these reports were likely to be reviewed by other educational authorities.

The following year, *The Times* published an interesting article by their unnamed Canadian correspondent that made reference to the “instructive discussion of bilingual

teaching . . . at the Imperial Education Conference of 1911” (*The Times*, February 6 1912, p. 5). Not only had the experiences in bilingual education of different regions in the Empire been shared, there had also been agreement concerning the importance of education in the student’s first language upon the commencement of his schooling and for some time afterwards. This said, the article continued: “At the moment, this would hardly be admitted by the more extreme protestant element of Ontario. On the other hand, the French Nationalists resist the agitation against French teaching and freely denounce the leaders of the English movement” (*The Times*, February 6 1912, p. 5). The article then discussed the little potential of success of any restrictive language policy in Ontario. In so doing, this article became an indicator to its readers, including to those in Alberta, that the view taken in London was quite different then that upheld by the staunch Loyalists in Ontario.

The articles about the IEC of 1911 were then followed by an article in which was highlighted the radicalism of the English-only organizations in Canada. In August of 1912, *The Times* drew attention the Orange Order’s official declarations in Canada whereby it encouraged its members to oppose the trend that was taking root in terms of the extension “to other provinces the lingual privileges which the French race unfortunately enjoys in Quebec” (*The Times*, August 8 1912, p. 5). While it did not mention the IEC of 1911, this article nevertheless demonstrated the difference in mentality established at that conference and the mentality that was prevailing in certain parts of Canada. *The Times* not only informed its readership of the direction taken at the IEC of 1911, this newspaper also communicated that dissention existed among English-

speaking Canadians with regards to bilingualism in education, as promoted by the Board of Education and the imperial representatives in 1911.

Conclusion

In 1907 and in 1911, member nations of the British Empire were invited to share their experiences in education, including bilingual education, and learn from each other. Following the fall out of the Second Boer War (1899-1902) and other conflicts, as well a change in British governing parties, bilingual education was viewed differently in London. In 1907, an initial discussion about bilingual education promoted the value of learning English as a second language and the efficiency of the Direct Method. By 1911, the new appreciation of bilingual education was reinforced given the successful earlier establishment of bilingual education in Wales and its recent implementation in South Africa. These examples contradicted not only the claims made by Freeman and Laurie about the dangers of bilingualism, but much of the dominant English language psychometric research in bilingualism that emphasized mental development delays associated with bilingualism, regardless of the socio-economic conditions.

In both Wales and South Africa, bilingual education was seen as a peaceful way to bring about a *rapprochement* between English-speaking and non-English-speaking people that would ensure the stability of their respective governments and societies. This was clearly enunciated by the South African delegate, Dr. Viljoen, in his explanation of the bilingual issue in his homeland when he expressed that their bilingual education system would be “in the interests of the nation” and would ensure the “extinguishing of controversies which have embittered the past” by enacting a real sense of equality in their country, that was founded on a “tolerant and comprehensive spirit” (Imperial

Government, 1911, p. 250). Nonetheless, Canadian delegates seemed unmoved and less enthusiastic about bilingual education than their Welsh and South African counterparts.

The sustained consideration shown to the delegates of South Africa and Wales at the conferences in 1907, and 1911, was indicative of London's new response to different interests and bilingual education in particular. Articles in *The Times* further perpetuated a positive message concerning bilingual education, either by direct conference coverage or reports about different parts of the Empire where bilingual education was an issue. The growing appreciation of bilingual education was clearly demonstrated in these earlier educational conferences that set the template for formalizing this new position at a future meeting.

Chapter 9: The IEC (1923) and the IEC (1927)

After 1911, on account of the outbreak of WWI, the Imperial Education Conferences had been suspended. At the war's conclusion, the Advisory Committee of the Imperial Education Conference had surveyed the governments of the Empire and arranged for these conferences to resume. In the 1920s, two Imperial Education Conferences occurred that encouraged a sense of inclusion throughout the Empire. The first, in 1923, was a landmark event in bilingual education that formally acknowledged the value of different languages alongside English in the Empire's classrooms. The next conference, in 1927, built upon the gains in bilingual education from 1923 and sought to bring the world into the classrooms by means of technology in order to further foster a better understanding of people everywhere.

The Imperial Education Conference (1923)

The Imperial Education Conference that followed the 1911 conference took place in late June and early July 1923. One of the main issues discussed at the 1923 Imperial Education Conference centered upon the need to better recognize the education offered throughout the Empire in order to facilitate the movements of teachers and post-secondary students alike within the Colonies, the Dominions, and Great Britain. Another important topic at the Conference dealt with the ways to meet various educational needs, such as the education of rural students and the education of students with differing physical or intellectual abilities. A common theme throughout the discussions was the need to strike a balance between accommodation of different circumstances and the desirability of commonly held standards of proficiency. Nowhere was this search of equilibrium more in evidence than in the discussions during the session that dealt with the

issue of bilingual education. That session gave rise to a special conference committee composed of representatives of multilingual states of the Empire, including the Dominion of Canada. This committee put forth six resolutions pertaining to bilingual education that were all unanimously adopted at the Conference. As a result, not only was bilingual education officially acknowledged in London by high ranking officials of Great Britain and member states of the Empire, it was given approval and concrete direction as well.

The Session Entitled “The Bilingual Problem . . .”

To launch the discussion, the representative of South Africa, Dr. W. J. Viljoen first presented how his country had established a framework that would both promote equality of the country’s two official languages, in law and practice, while accommodating individual expectations and needs. This presentation was much like a follow-up of his talk at the 1911 Imperial Education Conference with more details and the added benefit of years of experience.

According to Dr. Viljoen, the government’s plan had been to ensure access to a bilingual education in order to create a united citizenry. Although Dr. Viljoen iterated again and again that bilingualism was no longer a political question in South Africa, it should be understood that the meaning he intended to convey, as seen upon closer examination of his explanations, was that bilingual education was not influenced by political partisan interests. Bilingual education, as a tool of peacemaking and nation building, was non-partisan (Imperial Government, 1926, pp. 178-179, 183).

Dr. Viljoen first explained how language legislation in education had been formulated to ensure equality between the South African Dutch or Afrikaans language, and English, while respecting the parents’ rights to make choices concerning their

children's education in one or both of the country's official languages (Imperial Government, 1926, pp. 178-181). Even in the case of other languages spoken in children's homes such as German or Hebrew, efforts were made by the Ministry of Education to satisfy parental choice (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181). Although the objective was to promote bilingualism in the nation's official languages throughout the education system, the orator stressed that bilingual education was not imposed; students could still receive an education in one official language, if that was indeed the parents' wish (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 180).

Dr. Viljoen then addressed how this language equality translated into a bilingual education system. He reviewed the stages and factors that shaped the introduction of the second language (L2) into a child's education. According to Dr. Viljoen, there were three steps that were followed. Introduction to conversational practice in the L2 was encouraged at the earliest age possible in order to facilitate friendly interactions within the community. While it was accepted that instruction in both official languages should not start in concert (presumably to avoid alleged confusion for the students), the development of conversational skills in the L2 was an acceptable practice (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 182). In Dr. Viljoen's words, the idea was to promote the other language as "being a living thing, living on the lips of the next door neighbor" (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 182). It is noteworthy that this emphasis on social interaction in early L2 learning contradicted everything that S.S. Laurie had promoted. By the time the child was around nine years of age, an introduction to reading in the L2 could begin and by approximately 11 years of age, formal teaching of the second language as a curricular subject included composition in the second language (Imperial Government, 1926, p.

182). In this way, when most students finished their primary education four years later, and perhaps left school all together, they would have had years of practice with their L2 in oral, reading and written exercises. Aside some exceptions, such as the teaching of Hebrew in warranted situations for example, a third language was generally never introduced in the primary standards or grades, but only after the primary grades were completed (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181).

With regards to the choice of the language of instruction, this was determined less by age than by mastery. It was understood that the student's second language could only be used as the medium if the student had reached a level of competency in that language, in order for the instruction in that language be beneficial (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 182). Whereas the legislation provided for "an equal standard of proficiency in both languages", it was understood to signify that each student should have equal opportunity to learn both official languages well (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181). A second language speaker was not expected to have the same proficiency as compared to a first language speaker of the same age, but similar proficiency to a younger first language speaker. Given the small probability of a student to be at the same academic level in English as well as in Afrikaans, it was quite acceptable that a student at a certain standard (or in a certain grade as it would be understood in the Canadian context) in the first language education would be at a lower level (grade or standard) in the second language education (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181). As promotion to the next higher standard (or grade) depended on the level of proficiency in the student's first language, the discrepancy in mastery between a student's first and second languages did not have any academic consequences (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181).

The primacy of the student's first language development was made clear. In instances, as in some rural schools where student attendance was difficult to establish, exception to bilingual education could be made. In such cases, Dr. Viljoen explained that the focus of instruction could remain exclusively on and in the child's first language. This protected against the creation of a patois or, to use his word, a "jargon" that could arise if the different language rules were not properly respected and everything got mixed up (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 182). The view was that learning only one language correctly was better than learning two languages badly. Presumably, this accommodation also allowed coverage of as much curricular knowledge as possible in the limited time the student would be in school.

Finally, Dr. Viljoen came to the linchpins of a bilingual education system: the teachers and the inspectors. Not all educationalists were conversant in both official languages, let alone any other language. Therefore, as Dr. Viljoen stated, "facilities had been provided and disabilities had been removed" (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181). By this he meant that with the addition of resources, expectations had been made reasonable. Whereas the teachers already in service prior to the new language legislation were not penalized if they were unilingual, teacher education since the legislation included opportunities for unilingual pre-service teachers to become bilingual (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 180). The implication of this modification in teacher education meant a greater ease with which to fill teaching assignments, wherever the needs arose. As for school inspectors, while there was a general expectation of proficiency in both official languages, Afrikaans and English, there was also strong encouragement for some

inspectors working in particular areas of the country to become familiar with one of the indigenous languages as well (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 181).

The South African presentation in 1923 resembled an in-depth review of the presentation from 1911 with additional insights from over a decade of practical experience. South Africa's approach to bilingual education was acclaimed by all. Sir Alfred Davies of the Welsh Department of the Board of Education immediately pressed forward the objective of formulating some guiding principles to assist all bilingual states of the Empire and allow them to benefit from the South African experience. While the representative of Malta, Professor T. Zammit, welcomed such a plan, others in attendance were less enthusiastic.

Despite the South African accomplishments, there was a general feeling that the South African situation was too different from situations elsewhere, particularly in Canada and India. These realms of the Empire were perhaps the most insistent on the difficulties dealing with an abundance of languages. If in India, English was the common language for business, which of the multitude of other languages could be considered equal to the task? The problem in India was that historically, even before the presence of the British, the choice of one dominant language had been the source of bitter divisions, according to the delegate Mr. K. S. Vakil and his colleagues (Imperial Government, 1926, pp. 185-186). Canada's representative held a similar argument.

The lone Canadian delegate in attendance, Dr. F.W. Merchant, knew from experience in leading a commission on the question in Ontario, just how complex and delicate this matter was in Canada. Dr. F. W. Merchant was first author of *High School Physical Science, Part I - Revised Edition* and *High School Physics*, both of which were

well known texts and widely used in Alberta (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1912, p. 116; Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1914, p. 2).

He was already known in Canadian educationalists' circles in 1911-1912 when he surveyed the situation of bilingual schools in Ontario and found that indeed, generally speaking, bilingual schools fared poorly. The reasons however, had to do with the quality of the teaching and not bilingualism per se. When quality teachers were involved, a quality bilingual education was successfully accomplished (Merchant, 1912, p. 72).

Given that most bilingual schools were led by under educated young teachers, Merchant had recommended more support for these teachers (Merchant, 1912, p. 81). Moreover, not only had he depicted school inspectors as much needed allies of teachers instead of their wardens, Merchant had also cited the need for better high school preparation for Francophone students in the province of Ontario (Merchant, 1912, p. 80).

Although Dr. Merchant had not attended the 1911 Imperial Education Conference, he had referenced the discussions on bilingual education in his report in which he proclaimed his agreement with the conclusions of the discussions on bilingualism from the 1911 Imperial Education Conference.

My conclusions, I find, are in accord with those of others who have investigated the bilingual problem in other parts of the Empire. A discussion on Bilingualism was held at the recent Imperial Education Conference. . . . While the delegates differed regarding the question of the time when English should be introduced into the course of study, and also regarding the stage at which it should be used continuously as the language of instruction, all were agreed that the child upon

entrance to school should receive his instruction through the vernacular.

(Merchant, 1912, p. 72)

However, the Ontario government ignored Merchant's analysis and recommendations, as well as the IEC's conclusions from 1911. Instead, the Ontario government focused solely on the finding that in general, bilingual schools fared poorly. As a result, the government enacted Regulation XVII, thereby severely curtailing the use of French in Ontario's bilingual schools and fanning the flames of discord that pitted French-speaking Catholics against English speaking Protestants and Catholics for years to come.

Canadian and British newspapers had demonstrated reoccurring interest in the bilingual school question in Ontario during the first quarter of the 20th century. For over a decade, the opposition of the French language communities in Ontario with their government was closely followed, as was the awkward situation that continued between French Canadian Catholics and the Catholic Bishop of London, Ontario (Farrell, 1968). This situation had made headlines across the Atlantic as "Bishop of London's Critics", followed by a description of the uneasiness between Bishop Fallon and the French Canadian Catholics of his flock, after he had sided with the government against bilingual schools (*The Sunday Times*, August 29 1926, p. 12).

As a journalist, as founder of the Québec newspaper *Le Devoir*, and as an elected politician at times in Ottawa, at times in Québec City, Henri Bourassa had personally crusaded against Regulation XVII. A "vigorous defender of Canadian nationalism against British imperialism", his exceptional oratory skills made everyone listen, both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians alike (Lévesque, 2014, p. 4).

Bourassa rallied French Canadians in Québec with French language communities outside Québec to uphold the equality of the French language and the English language in the public space by shining a spotlight on the cause of French-English bilingual education in Ontario and the Prairies (cf. Betcherman, 2002; MacFarlane, 1999). In 1927, upon the A. C. F. A.'s invitation, Henri Bourassa would visit Edmonton, Alberta, where he would cover many topics in front of both Francophone and Anglophone audiences (*L'Union*, September 22 1927, p. 1; October 13 1927, pp. 1, 6). In 1927 at the Hotel MacDonald, in front of members of the Canadian Club, the Chambers of Commerce and the Kiwanis Club, Bourassa spoke about the Catholic school funding question and the natural resources debate in Alberta. Following the speech, Joseph Clarke, past mayor of Edmonton, wondered aloud why they had had to wait for an Easterner to come and inform them all of these things that should have been in school books for all to know (*L'Union*, October 13 1927, p. 1).

Bourassa's repeated message was that mutual respect was key to solving problems and was the basis of a united Canada. For Bourassa, "Un peu plus de compréhension et d'estime réciproques parmi les deux races principales, un égal attachement à la patrie, et nous deviendrons des Canadiens, des Canadiens unis, formant une nation unie" (*L'Union*, October 13 1927, p. 1). Such sentiment was lost on English-speaking Canadians the likes of Dafoe in Manitoba for whom French Canadians were at best a buffer against American culture and at worst a perceived isolationist thorn in the side of a Canada eager to stand shoulder to shoulder with the world (Cook, 1963). However, for English-speaking Canadians like Merchant in Ontario, the sentiment was better understood. Bourassa's message was already known to Dr. Merchant in 1923; he

also knew that the bilingual question in Canada was highly delicate. Whatever the outcome of the Ontario's Regulation XVII standoff, it would shape the destiny of bilingual education throughout western Canada as well.

Over the years, the French language newspapers across the provinces had often printed articles concerning Ontario's bilingual schools and Regulation XVII. The following newspaper headlines are examples of that coverage: "Les Orangistes et les écoles bilingues", a lament for Ontario's French-speaking communities (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, March 23 1911, p. 4); "Le français dans les nouvelles provinces" in which Ontario's bilingual schooling situation was deemed worse than that in Saskatchewan and Alberta on account of the Whitney administration (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, April 20 1911, p. 4); "La persécution dans Ontario" (*La Liberté*, June 3 1913, p. 1), an account of the Franco-Ontario situation; "Pour les persécutés en Ontario" (*Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, February 4 1915, p. 1), a local campaign to organize and raise funds among French Canadians of Alberta to provide financial assistance to French Canadian resistance in Ontario; "Les écoles bilingues de l'Ontario se consacrent à la Sainte-Vierge" (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, August 22 1923, p. 8), a description of faith as a source of strength in the continued rejection of Regulation XVII; "L'école libre à Pembroke" (*L'Union*, November 15 1923b, p. 2), the opening celebrations of a bilingual school. All of these examples demonstrate how the dire situation of bilingual education in Ontario had been closely monitored for years. The French language newspapers across the country had kept everyone informed of the ordeal and French Canadians across provinces had remained engaged in the shared cause.

Now in London, England, in 1923, Dr. Merchant succinctly pointed out the real differences between Canada and the other multilingual states that were represented at the session. Not only were there a growing number of European and Asian language groups already present in Canada, but given the dominion's size and capacity to support so many more people, the problem was only sure to become more complex and delicate. Simply in Ontario, the question was so onerous that he felt it impossible to speak of it at the conference and instead invited all those interested to read his provincially commissioned report from 1912. (Imperial Government, 1926, pp. 187-188). As such, he was very much aware of the fact that the bilingual problem, as it was termed, required attention but he was also very wary of looking to London for some kind of imperial intervention. This was 1923 after all and the Canadian position on dominion autonomy was clear. It was Merchant's view that just as South Africa had formulated its own solution, so must Canada, either as a whole or province by province (Imperial Government, 1926 p. 187-188).

Despite these arguments against a common ground, however, no one disagreed with the importance of teaching English in even the furthest reaches of the Empire. Even if it had to be as a second language, the English language was essential to every child's education throughout the British Empire: a point that was repeated time and time again (Imperial Government, 1926, pp. 184-186, 188). The acknowledgement that English might be taught as a first or second language was also recognition that the child's education ought to be carried out in the language that was best understood. Though this principle had been well established in Dr. Viljoen's presentation, some of the delegates,

such as Mr. F.H. Dutton from Basutoland, were keen to reaffirm it. Others, however, were just as keen to discredit it.

According to Dr. G. R. T. Ross, representing Burma as part of India's large delegation, there were practical and psychological reasons against the use of a language other than English in schools. For Ross, English was naturally the common language of public life and so it would benefit all to learn it. In his opinion, "there were millions and millions of unfortunate children in the Empire who, if they were going to get on in the world, would have to drop their mother tongue" (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 184). It was Ross' feeling that the bilingual problem was just that: a problem of determining how soon the mother tongue could be ignored in order to concentrate on learning English, especially in the case of languages that were, according to him, of no use in the modern world.

Not only did Dr. Ross argue against the practicality of a bilingual education, he argued that such an education presented psychological risks to the students. Without providing names, Ross referenced a study in Wales that had examined the effects of a bilingual Welsh-English education. He did not identify the study further but Saer (1923) and Smith (1923) had both been published in the *British Journal of Psychology*. Without having read Saer, Smith and Hughes (1924), the more detailed and nuanced account of the Welsh studies that was published the following year, it isn't clear at all in the journal article that the problem Saer finds against bilingual education is how it is done. The journal article could not go into detail like the monograph. According to Ross, researchers in Wales had expected to find intellectual benefits of a bilingual education such as increased mental alertness, but were disappointed to find that "the result was the

opposite” (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 185). He did not explain further but let the assumed understanding that bilingualism was detrimental to mental development remain unchallenged. In so doing, he played on the fears evoked in the prevalent and seemingly legitimate psychometric tests, discussed earlier. As there was no definitive study in bilingualism, Dr. Ross believed it to be unwise to move ahead with bilingual education without due consideration to the possible negative psychological effects.

Given this view and the line of questioning about “the handicaps and difficulties of a bilingual system of education,” Dr. Viljoen was compelled to reply (Imperial Education, 1926, p. 183). He specified that the textbooks used in South Africa were written by South-African men and women involved in education and that they were published by local and London publishing houses; it was a very collaborative and inclusive process. This enabled a successful practice of bilingual education. While Dr. Viljoen understood the fear that bilingual education might provoke confusion if not done properly, he felt that the infinite benefits, especially in a region where more than one language was spoken, outweighed potential risks. If a mental advantage had yet to be proven irrefutably in bilingualism studies, Dr. Viljoen asserted that the peaceful relations among citizens and the stronger civic and patriotic ties produced on account of mutual understanding of both languages was the inherent value of a bilingual education. In his words:

bilingualism afforded, on the human side, an opportunity of entering on equal terms with fellow country-men speaking a different language Mutual understanding encouraged mutual tolerance and forbearance, and above all, it discouraged the imputation of selfish and unworthy motives Their

experience of bilingualism . . . justified their going forward with a good heart.

(Imperial Government, 1926, p. 189)

Dr. Viljoen's argument was difficult to counter.

If the psychological argument against bilingualism found no supporters among the speakers at this session, the idea of the practicality of English as a common language did resonate with many. The representative from Nigeria, Mr. E.L. Mort, reported that while a common indigenous language was used as the medium of instruction, English was taught in primary schools as a necessity for as the students progressed in their education, English became increasingly the language of instruction. As such, the way in which a bilingual education was practical differed among the represented regions. If bilingual education was practical in South Africa for patriotic purposes, bilingualism elsewhere was a practical means to advance one's education.

In the end, it was decided that a committee should further explore the issue and develop a set of guidelines that could inform the governments in bilingual or multilingual areas of the Empire, with the understanding that each bilingual context was different and particular. Thus formulated by the Welsh representative, Sir Alfred Davies, the proposal was supported by Dr. F. W. Merchant of Canada, and adopted by all. The five member committee, made up of key representatives present at the session, was to present its conclusions to the larger conference. In addition to Sir A. Davies and Dr. F.W. Merchant, the group consisted of Dr. W. J. Viljoen, Professor T. Zammit and Mr. K.S. Vakil.

The Recommendations

This committee came up with six recommendations, entitled “General Principles for Bilingual Education” (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 286). These were accepted at the conference with a two-part caveat. First, that there be more research into the effects of bilingualism on “the intellectual, emotional, and moral development” of children (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 286). This was evidently to calm the concerns of potential negative side effects of bilingualism, given the popularity psychometric tests still enjoyed. Second, that all such work on the effects of bilingualism should serve to inform teaching practices in bilingual situations, “wherever it constitutes either a problem or a difficulty in the field of education” (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 286). Sharing findings would help decrease confusion and false assumptions on the subject.

The committee’s recommendations were included at the very end of the conference proceedings, in Appendix B (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 291). Quite literally consisting of the last paragraph of the *Report of the Imperial Education Conference 1923*, their work is an outline of objectives listed without details, or fanfare.

Their first recommendation was that English acquisition and competency should be an integral part of a bilingual education within the British Empire. This said, they added that upon starting school and for a time after that, the language of instruction should be the one the student is most familiar with. It is noteworthy that the second recommendation provided no clear indication of the length of time during which English could be replaced by another language as the medium of teaching. Instead, the committee recommended in the third guideline that student proficiency in the second language (L2) should determine the extent with which the L2 would become a language of instruction as

well as a subject of study. Although there is no definition provided, it seems understood that the second language in question here is the English language and as such, bilingual education seemed to have been designed with non-English native speakers in mind. However, no clause in the committee's report excluded English native speakers in a bilingual program of study. In fact, the brief report seemed to have acknowledged the parity of other languages with English and be worth learning as well.

Whereas the initial three guidelines seem to be more concerned with the acquisition of English and the use of another language to promote this end, the following recommendations go beyond the utilitarian advantage of the other language. The fourth recommendation emphasized the value of languages other than English, provided that these languages were established, complete with a literary tradition. If such was the case of the language that was most familiar to the student upon starting school and was the language that had been used as a medium of instruction in the beginning of the student's school life, then if possible, the committee proposed that the student should continue to be educated in both languages. The implication here is that once English had become sufficiently learned, it would not replace the other language in school, but be used alongside it. Moreover, the students would then continue their academic careers immersed in both languages. This was in stark opposition to the NWT School Ordinance from 1901, and certainly the Haultain Resolution of 1892. The fifth recommendation addressed the issue of the introduction of more languages into the program of study. The committee seemed to have a preference to delay such an addition until after the end of primary education. Accordingly then, education in a third language would generally not be advisable until the secondary level of schooling.

The sixth and last recommendation pertained specifically to teacher education. It had been recognized in the session's discussion that the presence of a language other than English in the classroom, either as a subject or also as a medium of instruction, was facilitated with bilingual teachers. As such, the committee agreed that teacher education should be modified to encourage a teaching corps proficient in English and other esteemed languages. Whereas as the University of Alberta had been providing French language summer courses for teachers for a number of years by this time, with the approval of the Department of Education of the province of Alberta, this initiative was not comparable to a Normal School for bilingual teachers, as would open in 1927 in Ontario, or indeed the *École de pédagogie* opened in 1923 at the University of Ottawa. It was, however, a step in the right direction.

Modification to teachers' education was particularly important given that other highly topical debates at the conference were the issues of teacher qualifications and salaries across the Empire, recognition of years of teaching service, and teachers' mobility within the Empire. Through association with teacher education, bilingual education was accorded even more legitimacy. For example, with respect for local practices and expectations, it was recommended by another committee and accepted at the Conference that the various Education Departments agree to a set list of requirements in order to recognize the certification of primary school teachers from other parts of the Empire. Bilingualism could now become part of the required criteria.

The Coverage of the IEC (1923) in *The Times*

In England, *The Times* provided regular coverage of the 1923 Imperial Education Conference. Moreover, each Saturday, *The Times Educational Supplement*, a physically

separate weekly paper but associated to *The Times* and also known as *TES*, presented the highlights of the week's conference discussions.

On June 10, 1923, *The Times* reported on the Duke of York's opening speech for the conference, and the word of thanks offered by the Duke of Devonshire. The Duke of Devonshire had been Governor General of Canada between 1916 and 1921. The Duke of Devonshire had also wished to echo the welcome offered to the delegates of different regions of the Empire. In welcoming the delegates, the Duke of Devonshire shared a story that he believed was telling of the importance placed upon education in all the reaches of the Empire.

He remembered visiting one of the new universities in Western Canada, where he was shown the plans of proposed extensions, and he could not help observing that they seemed so ambitious. "Yes" was the reply, "that is perfectly true; but you see, we are not building for to-day, to-morrow, or for ten years; we are building for centuries". (*The Times*, June 26 1923, p. 9)

The Duke of Devonshire's words were followed by a description of the first day's presentations and activities. Among the names of those in attendance and nominated to committee work during the conference was that of Ontario's Dr. F. W. Merchant.

As the first of many articles on the IEC, *The Times* not only provided an account of the first day of the 1923 edition of the IEC, it deliberately made reference to western Canada as a place where education mattered. The reported conversation had possibly been with past Premier Alexander Cameron Rutherford, or University of Alberta President Henry Marshall Tory as both were ardent promoters of the U of A as well as highly involved in a British program from called Khaki University that sought to help

WWI Union Jack soldiers transition back to civil society. Furthermore, Howard Angus Kennedy, known to A. C. Rutherford as *The Times* correspondent, had continued communications with the former Premier prior to moving with his son to Alberta, upon leaving *The Times* after many years (Rutherford, 1912; *The Montreal Gazette*, February 16 1938). The subtle acknowledgement of Alberta or at least western Canada, followed by the mention of Dr. Merchant, might have indicated that London was aware of the state of education and of the key educationalists in Ontario as well as in other provinces.

By July 2nd, 1923, *The Times* reported on the interest of using film in education. A week later, the proposal by Mr. Tate of Australia for a central committee in London composed of industry and educational leaders to explore the uses of film in schools was unanimously accepted. The newspaper emphasized that film could be useful in the proper conditions and in certain subjects, such as in history and geography for example. Films, in addition to traditional means, could bring lessons alive, provided they had been made well with the educational standards in mind (*The Times*, July 7 1923, p. 12). Interestingly, both *The Times* and *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* had printed similar articles. A few months after the conference, the proposed committee was formed and met in the autumn with Lord Gorell as chairman (*The Times*, October 26 1923, p. 14). Not only had the matter of film in education been a popular topic at the IEC, its popularity would only grow as the industry complied to cater to the educational niche. The developments in this dossier demonstrated the potential of these imperial meetings in real life and in real time (cf. Tepperman, 2004; Jann & Wegrich, 2007).

On July 4, 1923, *The Times* (p. 6) presented a review of the session on bilingual schooling. Following the positive account of the South African experience, the article

also featured the perceived problems with bilingual education, including the fear of delayed intellectual development of bilingual students. The article ended without any further remarks. The subject was not brought up again in *The Times* until the newspaper's review of the conference's conclusion.

The very next day, *The Times* reported that Dr. Merchant of Ontario and Dr. Viljoen from South Africa had each presented their paper. Whereas the latter had lobbied for increased powers for school boards, the former stressed the importance of the school inspector. For Dr. Merchant, the value of the school inspector resided in his potential to support and guide "local boards and teachers in perfecting school organization and in improving instruction", thereby promoting stronger ties between the different levels of educational administration (*The Times*, July 5 1923, p. 9). Dr. Merchant's presentation corresponded with his recommendations from his commissioned study eleven years earlier concerning Ontario's bilingual schools. Unperturbed by provincial politics, he had brought his views to the imperial arena and been applauded. It would now be more difficult in Canada for old Loyalist elements to dismiss or ignore his recommendations about the supportive role of inspectors and all that it implied.

On July 9, 1923, *The Times* published a piece that related the history and explained the purpose of the Imperial Educational Conferences, inviting the readers to also see the Saturday supplement for more information regarding the conference's developments. Moreover, this article provided a reaction to the Conference deliberations as opposed to merely reporting what had been discussed, including the proposed Bureau of Education that would coordinate the sharing of education-related information throughout the Empire. *The Times* praised the acceptance of a Bureau of Imperial

Education as “perhaps the most fruitful idea propounded” (July 9 1923, p. 13). In the words of *The Times*:

Such a bureau would, we think, be extremely useful both to our Board of Education and to the corresponding authorities throughout the Empire. It would form, by its publications, as it were, a permanent Conference, and would help to make such gatherings as that just concluded even more practically effective than they are at present. (*The Times*, July 9 1923, p. 3)

The newspaper was very much in agreement with the resolution to establish the Bureau of Imperial Education.

Once the business of the conference had ended, *The Times* continued their coverage of the delegates’ organized social visits. As such, on July 10th *The Times* reported that at a luncheon hosted by the Lord Mayor of the Corporation of London, where Dr. Merchant of Ontario and other delegates were present, and Dr. Viljoen of South Africa issued the delegates’ words of thanks and conclusions. While all the delegates had learned a great deal from each other, they had come to understand that there was no one general solution to the hurdles in all the countries’ education endeavors. This said, Dr. Viljoen continued, the delegates “had assisted, in a small way, to lay the foundation of what he would call a great international – Imperial, if they liked – commonwealth in education” (*The Times*, July 10 1923, p. 9). In a follow up interview with Dr. Viljoen, this vision of partnership was repeated. *The Times* reported Dr. Viljoen’s hope that this conference had made “encouraging impressions” and would show “good results” throughout the “great co-operative commonwealth in education” (*The Sunday Times*, July 15 1923, p. 15).

An example of proposed cooperation between the members of the “commonwealth in education” that had been inspired by the 1923 conference was a proposal to send men from England to various points of the Empire in order to further their understanding of its complexity and greatness. The idea, issued in a letter to the editor of *The Times*, called for paid extended stays of English public school boys, as well as men of influence and elected politicians, on farms in the colonies in order to gain a better sense of their fellows and their contributions to the Empire. This plan would promote better relations and closer ties between the British subjects everywhere (*The Times*, July 17 1923, p. 8). Whereas this was not a conference proposal, it is noteworthy because boys from England were in fact sent to work on farms in Canada and became a controversial point within French language newspapers in western Canada, and in 1929 among the Canadian delegates at the student imperial conference.

The Presence of the IEC (1923) in *The Times’ Educational Supplement*

Prior to the war of 1914-1918, *The Times* had customarily included an additional section on Saturdays devoted to educational matters. After the war, however, this educational supplement was no longer inserted into *The Times* but was still very much connected to *The Times*. It was called *The Times’ Educational Supplement*.

In the July 9th edition of *The Times*, readers were reminded that *The Times Educational Supplement*, the TES, had also included coverage of the IEC over the past month. On June 30 and July 7 for example, the TES had dedicated multiple pages in each issue to a review of the conference. The articles in those issues of the TES appear to be a collage of many weekday articles from *The Times*, therefore allowing the Saturday reader to get fully caught up on the week’s developments at the IEC. On July 21st, 1923, the

TES concluded its IEC coverage by printing the many resolutions from the conference, including the six-point recommendation for bilingual education.

It is significant that the wording of the bilingual education recommendations in the TES is exactly how it appears on page 291 in the *Report of the Imperial Education Conference Report 1923*. Therefore, the readership of *The Times Educational Supplement* would have known precisely what had been decided at the conference. Given the explicit reminder in *The Times* to also peruse the TES, and the appearance of articles in the TES without citing *The Times*, it is possible that these papers were so close that a subscription to *The Times* included access to the TES. Whatever the case, it seems likely that any reader of *The Times* with an interest in education would have been able to locate the information in the TES, such as Ollivier (1954) who cited *The Times*' reference to the TES and the TES' publication of the bilingual education recommendations.

Summary of the Imperial Education Conference of 1923

This conference demonstrated an authentic interest in collaboration and accommodation in order to provide education to everyone. The prominence of this conference in the London print media ensured that the discussions and decisions from the Imperial Education Conference were known to a greater public. While the South African experience in bilingual education retained the attention of *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, as did the practical use of technology in education, the landmark recommendations in bilingual education were never reported. Yet, despite the lack of local media coverage and mention in provincial Department of Education documents, the 1923 Imperial Education Conference remained nevertheless important as it established a direction to be followed

by authorities in what Dr. Viljoen had termed “the cooperative commonwealth of education”.

The accepted recommendations from different committees, such as those concerning bilingual education, and teachers’ education, as well as the presentations of innovative approaches related to educating students in rural areas or with other challenges, reflected a shared will to provide an education to all students, wherever and however they may be. Moreover, the 1923 conference ended with a promise to increase awareness in the classrooms of all corners of the British Empire. With the help of technology, the world could come to everyone’s school.

The Imperial Education Conference (1927)

Four years later at the next Imperial Education Conference, terms like “the Commonwealth”, as well as “the Empire” and “the imperial partnership”, peppered the conference addresses and report. All these designations of the British international community in transformation reflected a growing awareness of the differences among the membership, including the recognition of dominion autonomy.

The attitude of accommodation, so present in 1923, was now extended to encourage learning about the various nations of the British Commonwealth through acknowledgment of the role of vernaculars in education, increased teacher exchanges, and the integration of modern technologies in the classroom. In addition to the gramophone, the radio and the cinema were heralded as school aids assisting the ever-growing collection of lantern shows that teachers could use to better bring the furthest reaches of the transforming Empire closer to the students and their families. Facilitation of teacher exchanges, or interchanges as they were named, provided teachers with

experience and first hand knowledge of far away lands of the emerging Commonwealth that they could draw upon and convey in their lessons when back in their own classrooms. The visited schools would also benefit from the visits through learning about the teachers' points of origin. The attention accorded the role of vernacular languages in education in certain regions of the old Empire recognized the importance of continued use and development of the mother tongue in social and educational endeavors. In sum, emboldened by the resolutions of 1923, the 1927 Imperial Education Conference revealed an unwavering desire to strengthen ties among autonomous dominions and throughout the Commonwealth, as well as an even more inclusive attitude towards the cultures traditionally marginalized within the old British Empire.

Obstacles to Teacher Interchanges

In 1923, the pre-war idea of facilitating teachers' mobility within the Empire had materialized and in 1927, it had been found that there had been an increase of teachers availing themselves of this opportunity (Imperial Government, 1927, pp.10-12). However, as participation had been mainly confined to female teachers of the primary level, much discussion in 1927 was centered upon ways to increase participation of all teachers as well as school inspectors. At the time, only Ontario and New Zealand inspectors had taken advantage of this opportunity (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 20). Yet, it was generally agreed that exposure to different ways of providing education to people in different contexts would be useful for all educational agents. Egerton Ryerson, who had transformed the Ontario educational system less than a century earlier, had adhered to a similar belief. Accordingly then, it was believed that experiences "of the

practice of other educational systems may have practical results of the highest value” (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 20).

A major impediment to greater teacher and inspector participation in such exchanges was the problem related to superannuation, the recognition of qualifications and years of service that in turn affected the participants’ pension profiles. There was also the problem of different salary scales in different regions of the Commonwealth. As a result, lack of reciprocity in terms of service and salary was a principal hindrance to teacher interchanges.

Significantly, the Imperial Parliament had passed the *Teachers’ Superannuation Act (1925)*. This effectively led the way for other governments to follow with similar legislation that would safeguard teachers’ rights to reciprocity with regards to services provided, through provisions of equitable sharing of pension payments between educational authorities (Imperial Government, 1927, pp. 13-15). In addition, the Imperial Conference of 1926 had referred the matter to be further discussed at the following Imperial Education Conference, because it was “out of harmony with the general conception of the British Commonwealth of Nations that such hardship should attend the movement of a citizen engaged in public duties from one part to another of His Majesty’s Dominions” (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 13). This said, the discussions at the 1927 Imperial Education Conference revolved around what this parliamentary action represented and how to better align the salary scales and recognize teacher qualifications.

All these steps contributed to the facilitation of teacher mobility throughout the Empire. Such mobility was desired in order to foster greater understanding between regions and peoples of the emerging Commonwealth. In this way, travelling teachers

were like diplomatic envoys, most apt to convey to all their students the meaning of the “imperial partnership” and everything it had to offer (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 9). As “true missionaries of the Empire”, these teachers played a significant role in making their students feel connected to something bigger that transcended the classroom (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 12).

The Role of the Vernacular in Education

In 1923, discussions in vocational education, especially agricultural education, had included, in some cases, the use of the students’ vernacular languages. In Malaya, as well as in the Punjab, the vernacular languages had already been integrated into the schooling experience in order to impart agricultural knowledge at an early age and generate an awareness and even an interest in rural livelihoods. The philosophy in the Punjab was that “by including agriculture as an ordinary cultural subject something was being done to guide boys back to the land . . . as educated workers” (*The Times Educational Supplement*, June 30 1923, p. 305 in the archival record).

Following the 1923 approval of the bilingual education principles, representatives from the subtropical regions of the Commonwealth had felt that more time was required to discuss the role of vernaculars in their schools. Although these languages lacked the European roots and some lacked literary traditions like the other non-English languages discussed in 1923, the vernaculars in the subtropical regions were deemed important in education nonetheless. Given that these were truly people’s first languages, supplanting them for English in schools was found to be detrimental to the people’s development (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 44). It was, in essence, limiting their growth. If the point of British schools was to bring about social improvement, and allow talented individuals

to fulfill their full potential, regardless of their place of origin, then vernaculars had to be not only included in schools, but developed there as well. Such a position was in complete opposition of the Freeman claim based on assimilation. Moreover, according to the *Report of the Imperial Education Conference 1927*, this way of thinking was not entirely new, as this had been the position of the East India Company as far back as 1835. What was perhaps new was the strong wording used at the conference and the idea that this position should be that of the public administration.

At this conference, it was stated that a government-provided education in the mother tongue was deemed “the birth-right of every child” (Imperial Education, 1927, p. 45). Moreover, although English was deemed an important language to be acquired, it was the position that English should not replace the peoples’ first languages throughout India or Africa for example, and that the “indigenous tongues are not enfeebled or despised” (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 44).

As such, there was great interest in the example of an Indian state where Indian vernaculars were the language of instruction at the university level. It led to a discussion concerning the use of a lingua franca, an indigenous language that was understood by all in the region and that could be used when too many vernaculars were in competition (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 46). The adoption of an indigenous lingua franca as opposed to the imposition of English was deemed more respectable of the local inhabitants. A lingua franca, such as Swahili in East Africa, could be used in schools from the earliest stages and English could be added in later, thereby providing a bilingual education that corresponded with the needs of the people of a subtropical region. In the

case of a vernacular that resembled a world language, such as in Mauritius, a refined version of this vernacular could be used in schools (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 46).

What became obvious then, was the need for translations and written material for reading in the vernaculars. Translation offices would not only be responsible to create bilingual written templates for the traditional indigenous words, but they would be required to extend the traditional vocabulary of these vernaculars to reflect the modern day needs. While this was already happening in India for instance, it remained yet to be seen if the effort would be justified, or if English would become the public language of choice as the students became older (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 46).

In summary, the importance of local indigenous languages in subtropical regions was recognized, thereby justifying a delayed introduction of the English language in the education system. In addition, many avenues were discussed in order to allow the vernacular to be used along with the English language. The purpose was not to supplant English, but to allow the people to grow in both their local vernacular as well as in a world language. For this to occur, both languages had to be part of the formal schooling experience. It is striking how this was the same argument used for years in favor of French-English bilingual schools in Ontario, Alberta, and everywhere in between.

The Use of New Technologies in Education

Wireless communication was explained as being a service provided by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), a non-commercial government subsidized organization that could offer educational programs for school and home enjoyment “under the guidance of Advisory Committees” composed of “Education Authorities, teachers and others concerned” (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 79). Although there was still some

doubt as to the reception of the BBC programs in all the dominions at the time, it was generally felt that this was a technology that was soon going to be available everywhere. As such, a demonstration of this technology was presented at the conference: sample lessons in Astronomy, Music and French. The latter two were deemed especially well suited for broadcasted lessons.

The strength of wireless communications in education was two fold. Not only did it offer students exposure to “the inspiration of the expert”, it allowed this even in rural schools or night schools for adults, where students had the least opportunity to attend regular classes (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 80). The BBC could formulate and send literature as well as wireless lesson plans for the teachers and the students, ahead of program transmissions, in order to encourage a more engaged learning experience. Moreover, the BBC had also joined forces with the British Institute for Adult Education in order to better meet the needs of evening talks.

Evening talks could also benefit from educational cinematic presentations. British Instructional Films Ltd, in particular, made films depicting life in the all corners of the Empire. In so doing, they brought life to the geography and history lessons of the schoolbooks by presenting the people who lived in those places. This was deemed a great asset in education in order to make people everywhere aware of the different nations in the British Commonwealth. It was suggested that a centralized system be organized to act as a distributor of recommended films to the colonies, dominions, protectorates, etc., or at least, to act in an advisory role and formulate lists of titles of quality films. This information should then be shared with the different governments for the benefit of the people (Imperial Government, p. 80).

To ensure that proper depictions were made in the films, it was proposed and accepted that the Boards of Censors in the colonies, protectorates, and dominions include representatives of the local ethnic group(s) and of Education Departments. In this way, both European and non-European sensitivities would be protected, and misrepresentations would be avoided.

The integration of technology in education was important as it came at a moment when there was a demand to become better acquainted with the different nations within the Commonwealth. At this time, there was also a movement afoot to modify British history lessons in order to better recognize the contributions to the Empire made by various partner-nations over the years. It was reported at the conference that a two-year history and geography course of the Empire had been formulated. This course had been devised by the Imperial Studies Committee in concert with other associations. The Imperial Studies Committee and its partners also compiled an accompanying reading list that they circulated to all Departments of Education under the Union Jack. Next to Premier Rutherford's denial of Mgr Legal's request twenty years earlier for a more inclusive history book for Catholic students in Alberta, this revised Imperial history is demonstrative of the abrupt change in the dominant mindset.

The Coverage of the IEC (1927) in the *The Times*

While *The Times* reported that the IEC in 1927 would welcome greater representation of the Commonwealth, it also noted that the conference would not be accessible to the public or the media (*The Times*, May 24 1927, p. 18). This was similar to the situation that had characterized the preceeding Imperial Conferences. Nonetheless,

The Times managed to provide regular coverage of the sessions and daily conference events.

Following the opening of the IEC of 1927 by the Prince of Wales, the sessions began the same day. Among the first to present a paper were Dr. Viljoen of South Africa and Ontario's Dr. Merchant who both addressed the issue of education past age 12, and their presentations was followed by a visit for all the delegates to Gilwell Park, Sir Baden-Powell training centre for Scouts (*The Times*, June 22 1927, p. 11).

Education for the workforce was a reoccurring theme over the next few days at the conference (*The Times*, June 23 1927, p. 11; June 24 1927, p. 13). Dr. Merchant's point was that if the curriculum is interesting to the student, and the student can relate to it, the chances are greater that the student will stay in school longer and attain a higher level of education. This was presented in the context of vocational education with an invitation for the input of industry, reflective of Manzer's (1993) observation regarding the power of business in a liberal society's expectation of education at that time. The importance of relevance as argued by Merchant however, could equally apply in favor of bilingual schools. If the school language and curriculum were reflective of French Canadian customs and language, the French-speaking students might attain a higher level of education as well. That would in turn facilitate the recruitment of new candidates for Normal Schools and for teaching in bilingual schools. As the education level would rise among French Canadians, so would their economic prosperity and that of their constituency.

Over the course of the conference, *The Times* mentioned the role of radio or film in education on at least four different days. It first explained how the British Broadcasting

Corporation had become the chosen organization to manage educational broadcasts (*The Times*, June 29 1927, p. 10). In a follow up article, the emphasis was on the affordability of the film equipment for schools and the quality of the product as well as the subject matter. Among the BBC films shown was one that presented salmon fishing in British Columbia, Canada (*The Times*, June 30 1927, p. 21). The third article downplayed the value of film in schools, limiting its potential as a method for subject review as opposed to a teaching aid to stimulate critical thinking (*The Times*, July 5 1927, p. 11). Despite much discussion, nothing concrete was decided among the delegates given the experimental stage of broadcasting. However, the technology had elicited much interest for its use in the classroom (*The Times*, July 13 1927, p. 26).

On June 25, *The Times* printed the argument that had been made for more Music study in school as Music held “intellectual value” in its complexities and deliberate formulations (p. 9). And yet, like a neglected language study, Music was also en route to becoming “a dead language, known only to a few” (*The Times*, June 25 1927, p. 9). A similar fate threatened the French language in Alberta. This was in contrast to the situation of the vernacular languages that were increasingly present in the schools and at all levels in the warmer regions of the Empire.

One of the problems with the integration of vernacular languages was that of finding a balance between its use and the introduction and use of English. In India, where they had been trying to develop a literature in the vernacular, the English language thwarted these efforts. The use of English as the language of instruction seemed to “place the Indian student in an artificial world and impose an artificial obstacle to his acquisitions of modern knowledge and his contact with Western civilization” (*The*

Times, June 28 1927, p. 11). A compromise was suggested by the representative from Bengal who felt that religion and poetry might best be served by the vernacular languages while English should be the language of scientific and technological literature on account of the great difficulty of the Translations Bureau to keep up with the number of publications about modern innovations. For the representative from Bengal, all that mattered was that the student be able to read English, it mattered less whether or not he could speak it. In support of his idea, a course outline for learning to read in English was presented. The delegate from Mauritius, on the other hand, valued English speech. He praised the gramophone in English language education because it provided a means to learn how to speak the language and get away from the emphasis on learning the language as “a system of grammar” (*The Times*, June 28 1927, p. 11). In essence, despite that the second language in this context was English, this was a discussion where Professor Laurie’s style of second language education was confronted with a more interactive approach to second language learning.

In another article, bilingual English-Vernacular education was even proposed in the case of the European student growing up in far the reaches of the Empire. According to Mr. Ormsby-Gore, Under-Secretary for the Colonies, while boarding schools, the cadet movement, and Baden-Powell’s scout movement had been promoted as good elements of a European student’s education in a subtropical region, they did not replace the need for bilingualism. In his opinion, “a real mastery of the native language was an essential element in the education of the European child in those countries” (*The Times*, June 29 1927, p. 10).

These articles from *The Times* were important as they illustrated some different approaches to bilingual education. Moreover, they illustrated the motivations behind the different approaches and that information might have informed the Canadian situation where bilingual education was a very complicated and sensitive matter at the time. Fear of losing the first language when English was the language of instruction in school was a reoccurring complaint by French-language speakers and this was apparently a shared fear in India. The use of the gramophone, in order to learn a language phonetically, went against all of Laurie's pedagogy as it promoted verbal communication as a priority instead of access to the culture through the written word. Add to this the argument promoting a bilingual education for the British student that aimed for fluency in the second language as well as the first and it becomes easier to understand the threat that represented bilingual education. Bilingual education signified the loss of the exclusive advantage of the English language within the Commonwealth, because French and other languages would become equal to English. *The Times*, therefore, not only reported what had happened in the Conference, it informed the Canadian bilingual education debate as well.

In *The Times*, as in the conference itself, a common element was the focus on the needs of the people, whether it be the needs of people in the education system in the subtropics (June 30 1927, p. 21); the needs of teachers within the framework of evaluations (July 1 1927, p. 9); the needs of the student when dealing when revamping the geography and history curriculum (July 2 1927, p. 9); the needs of rural schools and their communities (July 6 1927, p. 21; July 7 1927, p. 13); or the needs of the students with different abilities (July 8 1927, p. 9).

As for teachers' pensions, recognition of teachers' qualifications, as well as equitable teaching salaries, *The Times* summarized that it was the responsibility of each Department of Education to establish reciprocity agreements with each other to deal with the salary and the pension questions as fairly as possible. The interesting point in *The Times'* report was in terms of recognition of qualifications. According to the newspaper, there was a will to establish a rubric of standards that would allow different Departments of Education to "assess the value of certificates granted in other parts of the Empire with a view to general recognition of certificates which complied with these standards" (*The Times*, July 8 1927, p. 9). This was deemed important as it was recognized that 'other parts of the Empire' could just as easily be in another part of the same dominion as in another colony all together. Regardless, it was unfair to limit teachers' mobility.

Moreover, a qualifications rubric could effectively limit the discretionary powers that decided which certificates were recognized and which were not. Just like the Imperial Government had to justify its educational practices in its colonies at the League of Nations (cf. Whitehead, 2007), the Alberta Government might be required to justify its limited recognition of teaching credentials to its peers in the Commonwealth. In Alberta, where teaching certificates from Québec (with exception to an arrangement with McGill, cf. Mahé, 2002) had never been recognized as in Saskatchewan, there were very few qualified French-speaking teachers who could teach in this province. In Saskatchewan, teaching credentials from Québec had been recognized in 1909 and two French-speaking school inspectors had been hired in the following years (McLeod, 1979, p. 68). In Alberta, the first French-speaking inspector was hired in 1912 and he was rarely in charge of schools within French speaking communities (Mahé, 2001). A second French-

speaking inspector was not hired until 1929 (Mahé, 2001). The discrepancy between the two provinces on these points exasperated potential applicants from Québec and hindered teacher mobility, as demonstrated by a letter found in the Rutherford papers of the University of Alberta archives.

The letter of E.R. Rouleau to A.C. Rutherford reflected the complications pursuant to Alberta's distinct practices. Rouleau asked clarification regarding the securing of a first class teaching certificate for his daughter, a graduate of Laval and qualified in English (Rouleau, 1909). The recognition of teaching credentials was still difficult to understand in 1914. Hart (1981) has claimed that at this time a new arrangement had been established whereby graduates with teaching credentials from Québec could teach in Alberta, provided that they were qualified in English and followed another five weeks at one of Alberta's Normal School. However, there is no mention of the class of teaching certificate this would obtain. Under the new scheme brought forth at the IEC in 1927, the Department of Education in Alberta would not have been as free to regulate qualification recognition as before; and applicants such as Rouleau or his daughter might have had recourse.

Summary of the Imperial Education Conference (1927)

Although the discussions surrounding the use of vernaculars in bilingual education did not yield a conference resolution such as the bilingual education resolutions of 1923, these discussions were significant nonetheless. They displayed a sustained will to appreciate rather than to deprecate differences among the spoken languages in the Empire. The also recognized the value of learning both English and another language in order to promote a well-rounded education. The sustained effort to respect differences

was also evident in the continued promotion of teacher exchanges as well as the incorporation of new technologies into education, practices that could further support bilingual education in reality. Finally, the fact that the Imperial Parliament created legislation and became an example to other governments regarding the question of teachers' superannuation and that the Imperial Conference of 1926 referred the matter back to the Imperial Education Conference of 1927 is another testimony to the importance of these conferences in providing direction and inspiration for local governments of the Commonwealth.

The regular reviews in *The Times* ensured that the public could be aware of the new ideas shaping British education, regardless of the coverage provided by select local media in Edmonton and the absence of reference to this conference in government documents.

Conclusion

Within a context defined by a sense of respectful accommodation, the bilingual education resolutions in 1923 firmly established a more inclusive vision in education. Not only was there an acceptance to see other languages as equal to English, but there was also a will to translate this ideal into concrete measures, such as encouraging teachers and inspectors to incorporate second language study into their professional development. This in turn had the potential to further facilitate participation in the travel and exchange program for teachers and inspectors that commanded so much attention in 1927. On account of the successful adoption of the 1923 recommendations on bilingual education, delegates from certain marginalized regions of the Commonwealth expanded the discussion to include an appreciation of indigenous vernaculars in bilingual education.

Given the advances in the scope of bilingual education, the involvement of the imperial government to facilitate teacher exchanges, and the perceived educational advantages in burgeoning new technologies, an even greater inclusive outlook prevailed in 1927. At that conference, it was agreed “the Empire should be studied in perspective and in its proper setting . . . for an appreciative treatment of the contributions made to civilisation and to the Empire by the various races, non-European as well as European” (Imperial Government, 1927, p. 92). The Empire was becoming the Commonwealth.

In 1923 and 1927, guidelines were squarely established to inspire educational authorities in every corner of the Commonwealth to look not only unto London, but also to each other to expand their understanding of the great diversity that composed the British international community. Bilingual education, founded on respectful integration as opposed to imposed assimilation, became a recognized element of good pedagogy at the 1920s conferences. Moreover, the incorporation of new technologies in the learning experience had the potential to facilitate opportunities in bilingual education.

Furthermore, teacher and inspector interchanges within the Commonwealth could be dependent on bilingualism and therefore serve to promote bilingual education. As such, the bilingual education principles of 1923 as well as the discussions concerning indigenous vernaculars in bilingual education that followed in 1927, were both the product of a new way of thinking, as well as a means to further this new appreciation of difference within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Chapter 10: Bilingual Education in Alberta, 1920-1930

The advent of WWI provoked a change in the perceived value of bilingual education. As Great Britain's first and only bilingual Prime Minister, Lloyd George understood the practical benefits of greater second language learning as part of the educational changes his government would bring about with the Leathes' Report (1918) and the Education Act (1918). These changes helped prepare the way for the recommendations concerning bilingual education advocated at the 1923 Imperial Education Conference and the continued discussions at the 1927 Imperial Education Conference. In Alberta, political and academic leaders took note of these innovations in the UK and promoted similar educational policies within the province.

Bilingual Education After World War I

John R. Boyle, Minister of Education between 1912 and 1918, was known for his ambition to maintain an English-language schooling system in the province. He even claimed that there was no bilingual problem in Alberta, according to Auger (2004a, p. 474). The English-only feeling became more potent in the province when the First World War exploded. In 1915, a definitive resolution was unanimously passed in the Legislative Assembly:

That this House place itself on record as being opposed to Bi-lingualism in any form under the School system of Alberta, and as in favour of the English language being the only language permitted to be used as the medium of instruction in the schools of Alberta . . . (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, March 31 1915, p. 1; cf. Auger, 2004a, p. 474)

While Aunger (2004a) explained this resolution in the context of political fallout from a provincial by-election, the connection to WWI is also important to remember.

The larger social context in the early years of the war no doubt encouraged greater attachment to the ‘One Nation, one language’ sentiment in order to ensure the stability of the British Empire in this period. Indeed, during the war years and throughout the 1920s, while many English Canadians identified with a Loyalist attachment to the Empire, and many others favoured dominion autonomy, the line between the two camps would get blurred when it would be a question of assistance to Great Britain in time of war (Berger, 1970/2013; Cook, 1963; MacFarlane, 1999). Even when spoken of in terms of conditional assistance in a just cause, the definition of a ‘just cause’ would vary, as different degrees of emotional attachment to the Empire would cloud the issue (Berger, 1970/2013; Cook, 1963; MacFarlane, 1999). The one constant remained that the English language was deemed necessary for the unity of state, be it the Dominion or the Empire (Berger, 1970/2013; Cook, 1963; MacFarlane, 1999).

Given the alliance between France and England during WWI, however, the British soldier found himself in a unique position where his ability to communicate effectively in French increased his ability to defend the British crown. The fresh appreciation for the French language was carried home with many Anglophone soldiers upon their return from Continental Europe. When the heir of the local retail giant Johnstone Walker came back to Edmonton after his military service in France, he not only continued the French language customer service policy in his father’s business, but maintained a French language department to better serve his French speaking clientele, throughout his tenure as owner. The Scottish family’s experience in South Africa prior to

establishing itself in Edmonton, Alberta, may have also contributed to the business' progressive language policy vis-à-vis the local national minority (Blue, 1924). Johnstone Walker became a fixture in the local French language newspaper, even supporting the cause of French language use and education in Alberta (Riopel/Johnstone Walker, *L'Union*, December 26 1918, p. 1).

By the end of the First World War, then, the value of second language learning had become apparent. In England, a parliamentary commission, and a new *Education Act* would set the stage for the next Imperial Education Conference. In Alberta, a review of French language education for teachers and students would also soon be underway.

England's new Practical Education

In Alberta, there was the local awareness of British educational policy. The first hint of this was found in an article by Donatien Frémont in *Le Patriote de l'Ouest* that cited an unnamed British parliamentary commission report on foreign language teaching. It appeared that in England, there was a “general state of ignorance vis-à-vis modern languages” in the educational system (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, June 26 1918, p. 1, translation from French by author). According to Frémont's account of the commission's report, of all the European languages, French was the most suitable second language to learn, in terms of commercial value and intellectual benefits. In addition, he reported that the commission had found that French was extremely practical, as it was not only the language of diplomacy, but also a common language between people where English was not established. It is noteworthy that a year earlier in Canada, C.B. Sissons (1917, p. 210) had made much the same observations and concluded that bilingual education provided many benefits. The British commission's conclusion, according to Donatien Frémont of

Le Patriote de l'Ouest, was that French was the most important of all the modern languages and should hold the first place among second languages to be learned in British schools and universities. Moreover, Frémont reported that for best results in French language acquisition, the commission recommended that this language should be introduced in school earlier than fourteen years of age, as was currently then the practice. *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*'s Donatien Frémont concluded that the Anglophone Canadian provinces ought to follow England's lead in order to improve relations between Francophones and Anglophones of Canada. (*Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, June 26 1918, p. 1).

It is likely that Frémont was referencing the *Report of the Committee on the Position of Modern Languages in the Educational System of Great Britain* (1918), also commonly known as the Leathes Report, as it was headed by Stanley Mordaunt Leathes. Kessler's (1919) review and Bayley's (1991) analysis of the report support many points made by Frémont in *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*.

The Leathes Report (1918) highlighted the importance of modern languages based on their utility in business, in government (especially international relations), in regular education, as well in knowledge accumulation and informed understandings of others. By 'modern languages', the Leathes committee understood "living foreign languages" (Leathes et al., 1919, xxiii). In the committee's opinion, French was "by far the most important language in the history of modern civilisation" (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 58). To do business, to conduct public service, to gain access to new knowledge, to grow, and to learn about people, "a speaking knowledge of the language is the first necessity" (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 33). While the teachings of S.S. Laurie were not necessarily refuted by the Leathes committee, they were certainly surpassed.

The Leathes Committee acknowledged the success of bilingual education in Wales, and recognized the potential of bilingual education as an asset as opposed to “an impediment” (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 16). Furthermore, the committee acknowledged the positive effect of quality second language exposure in the home or in kindergarten classes prior to commencing school (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 72). These constituted excellent avenues to start learning a second language and provided that it was done well, there would be no adverse effect on the child’s mastery of her first language, English (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 71). These findings mirrored those in Ronjat (1913) and would be supported by Leopold (1949; 1939), Pavlovitch (1920) and Toussaint (1935).

Kessler (1919, p. 148) had remarked that proper use of the Direct Method and Phonetics were the committee’s preferred approach to modern language teaching. This supported the committee’s claim that the true disciplinary benefit of learning a living language could only be attained when the student could read, write and speak it with accuracy (Leathes et al., 1918, pp. 78, 88). “Reading, theatres, sermons, lectures, conversations – all these are good; but a chief part of the benefit is to be derived from the unconscious assimilation of the ubiquitous speech of the country” (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 73). This declaration in the report is even more significant to the provincial context as it coincided perfectly with Dean Kerr’s efforts at promoting the French language at the University of Alberta. According to the report, speech, followed closely by good reading skills, were invaluable in order to learn anything about different places and people (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 33). At minimum, students should be expected to at least develop good writing and reading skills across a variety of topics in their L2 (Leathes et al., 1918, pp. 90-91, 96, 128).

A main claim of the Leathes Report (1918) was that universities were key for establishing modern language education throughout society. Recognition of modern languages in schools required that schoolteachers be well educated, and universities were tasked with the education of teachers as well as the pursuit of knowledge (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 54). In 1949, Faculty of Education was established at the University of Alberta (Faculty of Education, U of A, n.d., online). This occurred after a long tradition of annual Summer Schools for teachers on its campus, dating back to the 1910s and over the years as it phased out the Normal School system.

The Leathes' committee felt that it was imperative for teachers of modern languages to not only hold a university degree in their field, and have spent at least one year immersed in a society of the target language, but that their proficiency should be certified. In addition, they ought to be better paid and provided with on-going opportunities to invest in their professional education (Leathes et al., 1918, Chapter XI). Given the recognition in the report of superior working conditions in other countries as compared to England, these points were deemed necessary to ensure teaching exchanges and further foster modern language education in the UK (Leathes et al., 1918, p. 179). Hence, the Leathes' Report prepared the foundations for the important discussions to be held at the Imperial Education Conferences in 1923 and 1927 in respect to second language education as well as teacher education and compensation.

The importance of modern language study in schools and universities, including in teacher education, was advocated on the basis of ensuring that British education remain relatable and useful in a modern world. As such, the Leathes Report (1918) was largely responsible for the displacement of Greek and Latin by the study of living

languages such as French. This, in addition to the promotion of an earlier start to formal modern language learning in schools and the in depth mastery of one foreign language as opposed to a superficial knowledge of many, served to make British language education more practical and valuable. Moreover, as Kessler (1919, p. 143) observed, and Dean Kerr's actions demonstrated in Alberta, while the Leathes Report (1918) was concerned with modern language education in the UK, its insights were valid for modern language education elsewhere as well.

Kessler (1919) was not in error when citing the international importance of the Leathes Report (1918). British imperial education matters were closely monitored by the United States of America. The same year of Kessler's review, the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, issued Bulletin No. 49 entitled *Education in parts of the British Empire* with updates in the education services throughout the sphere of British influence and with great attention to the Canadian provinces and the "the languages issue" (Department of the Interior, B., 1919, p. 3). According to Tomkins (1985/2008, p. 201), by 1923, the Carnegie Foundation had instituted a research project to study the state of modern language teaching in America. This then prompted the establishment of the Canadian Committee on Modern Languages (1924-1927), funded by New York's Carnegie Foundation, to research modern language teaching at all schooling levels as well as in universities and colleges throughout Canada (Tomkins, 1985/2008, p. 201). "The importance of modern languages in Canada for cultural, scientific, commercial, and industrial purposes was considered, with particular attention to the teaching of French (Tomkins, 1985/2008, p. 201). That the Canadian study had a strong focus on the

practical aspect of modern language study in harmony with the guidelines established in the Leathes Report (1918) is further evidence of a common ground with British interests.

Like the Leathes' Report (1918), the UK's Education Act (1918), sometimes called the Fisher Act (1918), also embraced a same sense of practicality. Among its objectives, the Education Act (1918) aimed to make education more accessible, improve secondary education and facilitate the inclusion modern language courses. English and "at least one other language", such as Latin or French, were expected to be taught in schools (Education Act, 1918, s. 7). Furthermore, the Education Act (1918) stated that "Individual students or special classes may, with the approval of the Board, follow a curriculum varying from the curriculum approved for the rest of the school" (Education Act, 1918, s. 11). This may have been a way to provide bilingual education that was doing so well in Wales, a foothold in the Act. It also could have served to inspire other governments to demonstrate similar flexibility, including towards to bilingual education.

In light of the Leathes Report (1918), the Education Act (1918, s. 15) also highlighted the need of qualified teachers whose remuneration was independent of government grants. Although strict economic conditions and budgetary cuts soon followed in the early 1920s (e.g., Geddes' Axe, 1922) and limited the implementation in the UK of some aspects of the new vision in education, the espoused ideals in 1918 became nonetheless readily known and diligently pursued as much as possible in Alberta, despite its own fluctuating economic conditions.

More Local Promotion of England's new Ideals in Education

A graduate of the University of Toronto as well as Harvard, W. A. R. Kerr had studied at the Sorbonne and taught at Adelphi University in New York before joining the

faculty of the burgeoning University of Alberta in 1909 (Macheachran, 1945, pp. 1-2). Author of two French language books, Dean Kerr was impressively fluent and at ease in French. A Conservative (he esteemed Sir John A. Macdonald), and a Protestant – a Presbyterian turned Anglican – Dean Kerr was known to be supportive of Catholic academic institutions and Edmonton’s French Canadian community leaders, (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). The good relationship between Kerr and the Rectors of the Collège des Jésuites and St. Joseph’s College recalled a similar precedent in Nova Scotia in the case of the friendship between the protestant Dr. Grant and the Catholic Archbishop Connolly (Berger, 1970/2013, p. 29). Kerr’s relationship with the Jesuit professors further illustrated Grant’s opinion that all Christian denominations should work together, such as in matters of education (Berger 1970/2013, pp. 29-30). Moreover, Kerr’s recognition of the Collège des Jésuites also paralleled the view expressed by Dr. Grant, a Queen’s University professor, who long upheld the value of the plurality of higher educational institutions in Ontario (Berger 1970/2013, pp. 25).

While working at Upper Canada College, prior to coming to the U of A, Kerr had been “on friendly terms with graduates of other Canadian Universities and of Old Country Universities” (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). Dr. Kerr had also known Dr. Parkin, who had been principal at Upper Canada College, before going to England as the first Secretary of newly established Rhodes Scholarship Trust in 1902 (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). As Secretary, though he was no longer as familiar with Canadian society, Parkin’s “journeys under the auspices of the Rhodes Trust . . . put him in touch with imperially minded educators throughout the Empire” (Berger, 1970/2013, p. 40). On the eve of WWI, Dr. Kerr and Dr. Macheachran were in England, on the final leg of their European

tour and not very far from Dr. Parkin in Oxford (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2; Berger, 1970/2013, p. 40).

Professor Macheachran, who had also studied at the Sorbonne before becoming a professor at the University of Alberta, wrote about his colleague: “He strove earnestly to encourage the study of the French language and literature, including the literature of French Canada, and to create a better understanding of the French Canadian people” (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). Berger’s (1970/2013) reference to the significance of a homespun literature on the national psyche is particularly relevant in relation to W. A.R. Kerr. Given Dean Kerr’s interest in languages and association with Dr. Parkin, Dr. Kerr would have closely followed the educational developments of 1918, including the Leathes Report (1918) recommendation to promote earlier French language learning. According to the account printed in *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Dean Kerr presented the components of the Education Act (1918) as a revolutionary review of the United Kingdom’s educational system to Edmonton area school representatives while it was still a bill under discussion in the British Parliament (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, February 23 1918, p. 3).

Post-war Language Education Opportunities for Teachers in Alberta

In 1917 in Alberta, language education for teachers via correspondence and in Summer School was deemed advisable towards “the improvement in scholarship to a large number of the teachers in the Province” (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1918, p. 41). This move towards greater language education for teachers was supported by an expanded view of geography in teacher-education to include a better knowledge of, and regard for, different nations, in order for teachers to

“enlarge and improve citizenship” in their pupils (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1918, p. 28). This initiative also demonstrated that the Alberta government was closely attuned with the new way of thinking in London, while the Leathes Report (1918) and the Education Act (1918) had yet been presented and the next Imperial Education Conference was still six years away.

In 1918, *The Edmonton Bulletin* reported that the almost 200 participants attending the Summer School for Teachers had a choice of 50 different courses (July 6 1918, p. 2). That year, the Summer School was held at the University of Alberta where the course in Oral French for teachers in Secondary Schools was found to have been “popular” (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1919, p. 12). For the first time, a course on teaching French in the direct method had been included among the courses offered in the Summer School for Teachers. According to Mr. G. Fred McNally, Supervisor of Schools, this “valuable” course allowed teachers to become competent in this approach for presenting the subject “in accordance with the new language regulations that came into effect at midsummer 1918” (Department of Education, 1919, p. 33).

In tandem with the recommendations of the Leathes Report (1918) and the Education Act (1918), the Department of Education of the province of Alberta encouraged greater possibilities for teacher education at the university in Edmonton. The Summer School in 1919 offered not only courses to teachers for professional development, such as the French Methods course, but also academic courses to allow teachers to pursue their university studies. Given that many teachers did not have the required language courses for university matriculation, Latin and French matriculation courses were also offered at the Summer School (Department of Education, 1920, p. 29).

In light of the favor of French over Latin advocated in the Leathes Report (1918), it is noteworthy that the number of teachers enrolled in the French matriculation class, not counting those taking the French Methods classes, outnumbered those in the Latin Matriculation class the following year (Department of Education, 1920, p. 37).

This paralleled a similar phenomenon in England where universities had swiftly adopted the Leathes Report (1918) recommendations and not only multiplied their modern language course offerings, with a strong emphasis on French, but had also witnessed dramatic increases in the numbers of modern language university graduates (Bayley, 1991, pp. 17, 20-21). The establishment of a Chair in French Studies at Cambridge was illustrative of the importance of this modern language in a proper British education (*L'Union*, June 5 1919, p. 4).

The continued presence in Alberta of the Summer School throughout the 1920s underscored the necessity of teacher education and the need for more teachers overall. Mahé (2002, 1997) has repeatedly argued that in addition to the general teacher shortage, there was a bilingual teacher shortage. Sissons (1917, p. 192) had estimated that approximately 400 bilingual teachers were needed in the Prairies at that time, while Mahé (1997, p. 75) believed that Alberta was short 30-50 bilingual teachers annually in the first third of the 20th century. According to Mahé (1997, p. 75), this shortage was compounded by the lack of French language education made available in Alberta's Normal Schools and grade schools. Given this chronic problem, French language education advocates sought more French language education, however incremental, at all levels.

A Balance Between the IEC Consensus and the Provincial Anglo-dominant Norm

With regards to the students, Auger (2004a, p. 475) observed that in Alberta, the *chefs de file* of the French-speaking community made a strategic choice. Rather than lobby for a change in the School Ordinance of 1901, something that would have been provocative rather than constructive, the leaders of the French-speaking community asked instead to revisit the interpretation given to the designation ‘primary course’. This proved to be a good choice indeed, given the repeated difficulties the Hon. Perren Baker, Minister of Education, would face in his attempts to have bills concerning education accepted in the Legislature during the 1920s.

The 1920s was a period where provincial governments’ concern for practical schooling led to the introduction of different educational streams, such as the vocational stream, into high schools (Manzer, 1994). During this decade, the idea of vocational education had even been discussed in London by Ontario’s Dr. Merchant. However, the government rationale to modernize the education system in order to make it more relevant to the needs of the students, the workforce, and society as a whole, was met with public resistance (Manzer, 1994). A similar situation existed in India, as intimated in the proceedings of the Imperial Education Conference in 1927, and clearly stated in Whitehead (1995) in his description of the emergence of the intellectual *babu* class and the motivation that prompted British authorities to advocate a more practical education in its African colonies. Given this state of affairs in Canada and beyond, the French Canadian tactic of asking for clarification as opposed to demanding more curricular changes seemed like the approach more likely to succeed in Alberta.

In Alberta, the School Act (1922), s.184.1 stated that “All schools shall be taught in the English language, but it shall be permissible for the board of any district to cause to a primary course to be taught in the French language”. However, the Act did not specify what was intended as the primary course. Given the support that bilingualism had from various influential pockets of society, the gentle approach by the provincial French Canadian *élite* might have been difficult to rebuke by Alberta’s provincial officials. At the imperial level, bilingual education had been discussed in London in 1907 and 1911 and the non-binding recommendations in bilingual education had been unanimously accepted at the IEC in 1923. Moreover, the increased French language study in the British educational system had been encouraged by means of the Leathes Report (1918) and the Education Act (1918). The local promotion by professors of the University of Alberta’s Department of Modern Languages, of the French language and the educational innovations taking place in the UK, had made newspaper headlines in the province. In Edmonton, as alderman and then as mayor, Ambrose Upton Gledstanes Bury, formerly of Ireland, could speak a little French and was a fixture in municipal affairs throughout the 1920s. He worked well with the French Canadian community on projects such as the centennial celebrations of Father Albert Lacombe (*L’Union*, July 7 1927b, p. 1). He even sought the French Canadian vote by addressing *L’Union*’s readership (*L’Union*, December 8 1927a, p. 1).

In contrast to the political endorsement of bilingual education from the UK, throughout the Commonwealth, proclaimed by the provincial academic *élite* and accepted as normal by key officials at the provincial capital’s City Hall, there were prominent groups promoting a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (W.A.S.P) society. Over the war years

and throughout the twenties, the Orange Order, the Sons of England and even the Klux Klan (the latter especially in Saskatchewan), were vocal opponents of bilingualism (McLeod, 1979; e.g., *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, June 15 1927, p. 3). In the spring of 1927, ahead of Ontario's provincial election, *The Edmonton Journal* published a particularly strongly worded article that focused on a speech by grand master Rev. W. L. Lawrence of the Orange Lodge and his rant against the Catholic Church and French language education in Ontario (March 10 1927, p. 20). In reference to the French language education question and Regulation XVII, the Rev. Lawrence of Sault Ste-Marie was quoted as having said:

Just how this violation of the law can be reconciled with patriotic citizenship . . . ?
. . . . There are even rumours to the effect that certain concessions are to be made on regulation 17 [sic]. What we wish to say is this: the Loyal Orange association is a unit behind regulation 17 [sic], and will in no way passively submit to radical changes or concessions. (Rev. Lawrence as cited in *The Edmonton Journal*, March 10 1927, p. 20)

The Orange Lodge and other like-minded groups' deep-rooted favour for unilingualism stretched from Ontario to Alberta. Less than a decade earlier, the intolerant stance vis-à-vis bilingual education had been clear at a meeting of the Strachcona's Sons of England within the vicinity of the University of Alberta (*L'Union*, November 1 1918, p. 2).

Faced with the local presence of English-speaking Canadians with a Loyalist tradition, as seen in Berger (1970/2013) and that contrasted increasingly with imperial example set at the London conferences in education, the Alberta government adopted a

soft position by the mid-1920s on the question of bilingual education. Without threatening the provincial Anglo-dominant norm, the provincial government's decision was somewhat satisfactory to the French Canadian interests, and somewhat similar to the established progressive view of modern language education in the Leathes Report (1918), and bilingual education as promoted at the 1923 Imperial Education Conference.

In accordance with Tepper (2004, p. 536), as Alberta's "disparate policy community" would not agree on bilingual legislation, "policy fragmentation" was effectively employed by the provincial Department of Education in an effort to keep the parties separately content, under the same legislation without the left hand knowing that the right hand incurred some additional linguistic considerations. Although such an approach is typically problematic, as explained by Kingdon (1984) cited Tepper (2004, p. 536), in this case, effective policy fragmentation allowed the French language community to persist until political realities changed (cf. Tepper, 2004). As such, it could be said that the provincial government avoided adopting "contested measures" and instead chose a course with limited implementation until such a time came that was "ripe for a more enduring course of action" (Jann & Wegrich, 2007, p. 54). That would occur decades later.

The New Departmental Guidelines for French-English Bilingual Education

In 1925, the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta published a new government document that extended the use of French in schools. Under the leadership of the Hon. Perren Baker as Minister of Education, the teaching of French as a subject for Francophone students after the second grade and throughout elementary school for one hour a day without conditional fees was finally authorized. It happened without much or

any discussion as there is no mention of it in the Legislature Library Scrapbook Hansard Collection. Auger (2004a, p. 475) reported “the Department of Education discretely published new instructions for the teaching of French”. This low-key approach to bilingual education differed from that of other changes in provincial education that bore great similarity to educational policy in the UK and that attracted much attention. In particular, a proposed 500\$ provincial grant to every teacher in non-urban settings and government-promised assistance to pioneer districts were discussed in the Legislative Assembly (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 10 1925, p. 3).

The significance of this dedicated funding was not lost on the MLA from Grouard, L. A. Giroux, who “warmly congratulated Mr. Baker on his scheme ” because “the plan would mean great things for pioneer districts where the people, and in many cases the teachers, has gone to great sacrifice” to provide education (*The Edmonton Journal*, April 10 1925, p. 3). As many French Canadian communities were in “pioneer districts”, the government assistance could offset cost, such as those incurred by the new French language program.

At a time of provincial political turmoil over railway extensions and the control of natural resources, and when UFA Premier Greenfield’s tenure was coming at an end, language education innovation was not at the forefront of provincial news. Perren Earle Baker, B.A., M.A., prosperous farmer, and Minister of Education was largely concerned with redressing the problematic state of rural education (Wilson, 1977, p. 27). The rural context was characterized by a shortage of fully operational schools and an abundance of unfavorable teaching conditions (Wilson, 1977, p. 27). Wilson (1977) has argued that Baker’s time in office was characterized by his concentrated efforts to address these

problems. In this context, while the French language programme could potentially complement the Ministry's goals by increasing the education level in French Canadian agricultural communities, it could also excite the passions of less tolerant Canadian imperialists who would further undermine Minister Baker's work. The Hon. John Boyle, for instance, who had been Minister of Education in 1915 at the time of the anti-bilingualism resolution in the Legislative Assembly, was still an MLA until 1924.

Judging from Cook's (1963) silence, as compared to his report of Dafoe's clear opposition to French language education in Manitoba and Ontario, it would seem that even the *Manitoba Free Press* editor John W. Dafoe missed or ignored the situation brewing westward of Winnipeg and Regina. By Cook's (1963, pp. 159-160) account, Dafoe's complaint of Henri Bourassa's involvement in Alberta's separate schools funding question was limited, as it pertained only to the question of provincial control of natural resources. This demonstrated the western editor's failure to perceive Bourassa as his antithesis in the protection of bilingual education through Catholic schools. Catholic schools were where most French Canadians sent their children. Classified advertisements of teaching positions in local newspapers demonstrated that these were where French-speaking teachers were most often sought (e.g., *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, May 25 1911c, p. 5). French language education was linked to publicly funded Catholic schools. In framing Henri Bourassa's interference as eastern Canada trying to further its exploitation of western Canada, or as Québec Liberals imposing their will in Ottawa, the language question in Alberta education was not highlighted.

In Alberta, courses in English, history and mathematics had traditionally dominated other subjects (Tomkins, 1985/2008, p. 197; Gidney and Millar, 2012, pp.

200-201). Foreign language education, as French was often considered by many Anglophones (e.g., *The Edmonton Journal*, March 8 1927, p. 16; March 17 1927, p. 7; *L'Union*, March 17 1927b, p. 1; March 24 1927, p. 1), was not as important and this is evident year after year in school inspectors' reports of the province where progress is defined in relation to advancement in the three aforementioned dominant subjects. When Education Minister, the Hon. Perren Baker, was made *Officier de l'Instruction publique* by the French government, in recognition of his efforts in French language education in Alberta, the story didn't receive much attention other than in the local French language newspaper (*L'Union*, January 19 1928, p. 1). With the quiet publication of the Department's booklet of instructions, outlining French language education for Francophone students of the province, the matter was not subject to new legislation and therefore stayed out of the public forum. It was to remain as such until the 1960s, around the time of the St. Lambert Project and the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Central Canada. In 1964, Alberta's School Act (1922) was finally amended to reflect these instructions that, by then, included Grade Nine (Aunger 2004a, p. 475).

Entitled *Instructions concerning the teaching of French in the elementary schools of the Province of Alberta*, the 1925 document broke new ground in the province of Alberta as it recognized the primary course as being comprised of grades one through eight and the continued study of the French language for one hour a day in grades three to eight for Francophone students. This resembled the Leathes Report (1918) that encouraged earlier exposure to the modern language and repeatedly called for daily one-hour sessions dedicated to the study of the chosen modern language for the duration of

the course. Moreover, teachers were allowed to explain concepts in French whenever it was found beneficial to the students' understanding at all grade levels, much like had been agreed upon in the pre-war educational conferences. Although this was limited French language education, both in terms of designated students and time allotted, it nevertheless permitted the beginning of the return of sanctioned bilingual education in Alberta. Moreover, this authorized bilingual education roughly coincided with the expectations laid out by the Imperial Education Conferences, leading up to and including 1923.

Bilingual Education in Alberta Following the IEC Recommendations of 1923

The new *Instructions* in Alberta in 1925 seem to indicate a parallel expression of this province's bilingual education policy and the Imperial Education Conference's recommendations on bilingual education two years earlier. Unlike the Leathes Report (1918), that had addressed French as a second language education for Anglophones in England, the new provincial instructions for French language learning in Alberta were designated for Francophones only: "In all such schools instruction in English shall be provided in all subjects throughout the course for all children whose mother tongue is other than French" (Department of Education of the province of Alberta, 1925, p. 1). Therefore, while the Leathes Report (1918) may have been useful to help justify the favor of French over other languages in Anglo-dominant Alberta, the new instructions in this province solely addressed the issue of teaching both languages to Francophone students, much like the recommendations of the Imperial Education Conference (1923) that were chiefly concerned with provisions for bilingual education for non-English speaking children.

Despite the provincial government's intent, however, there is evidence that some Anglo-Canadians in Alberta sought a better second language education for their children, in accordance with the reasoning expressed in the Leathes' Report. Gibault (1939) found that in bilingual schools of the province, there were students who spoke English at home and yet followed the French programme. When compared to other Anglophone students in English schools, Gibault (1939, p. 48) observed that "English children in English–French schools do as well as those in English schools". While the practice of immersing Anglophone students in a French language programme was not widespread across the province at this time, Gibault (1939) demonstrated that when the opportunity presented itself, Anglo-Canadians were likely to avail themselves of the opportunity and achieve the same practical second language goals as those promoted in the U. K., distorting the original intent of the policy in Alberta (cf. Jann & Wegrich, 2007). Although Gibault's research occurred later than the 1920s, his findings are directly related to the established programme and offer the earliest insights about it.

The Imperial Education Conference (1923) had accepted six principles for bilingual education and with the issue of the new instructions for French language education for Francophones, Alberta could claim to have chosen to address them all. There was no question in this part of the British Empire that English was to be taught to all students, regardless of their first language, as per the conference's first recommendation. Moreover, as had been the practice in Alberta for decades a priori of and in accordance with the second recommendation, French was the language of instruction for Francophone students during the "preliminary stages of school education", the first year or two, until they understood English (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 291).

Given that English had been introduced and become familiar to these students over this same period of time, instruction in English would then come to characterize the schooling experience, “in some or all of the subjects”, just as outlined in the third conference recommendation (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 291). As had been recommended in the fifth principle concerned with the introduction of a third language, no other languages were part of the provincial curriculum until high school or secondary school. Finally, a French course for matriculation purposes as well as a course about how to teach French had been established in the Summer School for Teachers at the University of Alberta as early as 1918, thereby reflecting a local adaptation of the principle concerning language education for teachers in bilingual schools even before it had been formalized at the 1923 conference. Now, as of 1925, with the instructions for French language education as a *fait accompli*, the province of Alberta also voluntarily chose to adopt a similar interpretation as set by the fourth recommendation of the Imperial Education Conference (1923).

The fourth principle of bilingual education as accepted at the conference read as follows: “In cases where the two languages . . . are both highly developed and possess an adequate literary content, instruction in them should thenceforth proceed concurrently, where the organisation of the school permits, throughout the whole school course” (Imperial Government, 1926, p. 291). As previously discussed, the foreword of the provincial French language education instructions stipulated that “in accordance with Sec. 184 of the School Ordinance, French shall be for the French-speaking children one of the authorized subjects of study and may be used as a medium of instruction for other

subjects during the first school year” while making provision for the oral and formal teaching of English (Department of Education of the province of Alberta, 1925, p. 1).

These new instructions were not simply a regurgitation of past policy but provided an extension of established policy, such as discussed by Hogwood and Peters (1983) in Jann and Wegrich (2007). As such, the provincial UFA government eyed a way to complement its own education reforms with a measure that could pacify French language education advocates, and retain the French Canadian farmer’s vote without losing the support of their English Canadian electors. If pressed, this action could be further justifiable as a willing show of solidarity with the Imperial consensus in London, as opposed to an example of succumbing to French language interests from eastern Canada.

At this time there lingered a climate of suspicion in English Canada vis-à-vis anything related to French Canada, as well as in western and eastern Canadian relations, as highlighted in Berger (1970/2013), Cook (1963), and MacFarlane (1999). In the political arena, Ottawa was still withholding full provincial rights in regard to Alberta’s natural resources, thereby limiting provincial revenues to finance public works. The problems in education were compounded by the question of publicly funded Catholic education that was attached to the question of control of the province’s natural resources. In addition to this, bilingualism represented challenges the UFA government in and out of Education.

The 1920s were a mixed bag of good and bad economic times in Alberta and that shaped the political options of the provincial government. As early as 1923 and for over a decade, the Peace River area in the north repeatedly drew attention at the Chicago

International Hay and Grain Show for its prize-winning wheat crops in particular (*The Edmonton Journal*, September 2 1945, n.p.; *L'Union*, December 8 1927, p. 1).

Paradoxically, fluctuations in crop prices and weather (especially in southern Alberta), combined with increasing costs (e.g. tariffs) and rural isolation (e.g. underdeveloped rail/roadways), made farming “a risky business during the 1920s” (Wislon, 1977, p. 26).

In addition, labour interests were getting louder. Bilingual Labour MLA Gibbs had particularly espoused the cause of teachers. He persistently attacked the government on its ineffectual legislation that provided no job (or salary) protection for teachers in labour disputes (e.g. *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Friday March 25 1927, n.p.; *The Edmonton Journal*, March 9 1928, p. 7). Although this was a potential threat to all teachers, French-speaking teachers could face particularly difficult battles with English-speaking school trustees (cf. Mahé, 1997; 2000).

Within this context, the Ministry of Education in the 1920s tirelessly though unsuccessfully tried to implement reforms in education that affected teachers and the schooling districts in order to better ensure much needed education in the rural areas (Wilson, 1977). Headlines like, “Province will endeavor to keep rural schools supplied with teachers” in 1922, “No dearth of teachers – Alberta schools well supplied” in 1926, and “\$200,000 Edmonton Normal School will be complete in 1929” in 1928 intermittently peppered the pages of *The Edmonton Journal* throughout the decade (March 11, 1922, n.p.; September 2 1926, p. 9; March 9 1928, p. 7). The announcement on p. 3 in *The Edmonton Journal* of a “\$500 grant to each teacher [in a] rural school” April 10th, 1925, strongly recalled a similar plan in Ireland concerning bilingual teachers reported in *The Times* May 29th, 1906. By 1929, the UFA government assured French

Canadians that the plans for school consolidation would not only be an advantage to all rural schools, “qu’elles soient catholiques, protestantes, ou canadiennes-françaises” but that most schools in the French language communities “y trouveront un grand profit” (*L’Union*, January 10 1929, p. 1; *La survivance*, November 29 1928). The French speaking MLAs, however, blocked the passage of the Baker Bill until 1931 (Hart, 1981). Their opposition was because school consolidation could promote assimilation.

Burdened with problems throughout the 1920s decade and seeing how the French language issue in Ontario had contributed to problems there, the UFA government in Alberta needed options. Given the traditionally close association of French language education and Catholic schools dating from the pre-provincial period, the Catholic education funding issue that accompanied the question of control over the provinces natural resources could be further complicated by bilingual education demands (cg. Betcherman, 2002; MacFarlane, 1999). Prominent English-speakers such as MLA Gibbs and Professor Kerr were visibly bilingual education boosters, and added political weight to the French Canadian position. As a measure to strengthen the UFA’s legitimacy, and avoid looking like it was acting under Québécois influence, association with London could be beneficial: London could act as “outside validation” (Tepper, p. 531). The provincial government therefore had good reason to look at the IEF and see how “to incorporate new knowledge . . . into their decisions” (Tepper, 2004, p. 532). Association with the same ideas as promoted in the Imperial Education Conference recommendations for bilingual education, as well as consideration of the future re-instatement of official provincial representation in England, could also assist the province’s economic interests, as well as provide a shield to deflect opposition to bilingual education.

The provincial government of Alberta paralleled the direction given in the Imperial Education Conference recommendations of 1923 by specifying in the *Instructions*' foreword that French language education would continue "beyond Grade II" enabling, *de facto*, a schooling environment where both English and French could be taught and used concurrently, especially as teachers were authorized "to offer explanations in the mother tongue when necessary" (Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1925, p. 1).

In addition to the foreword, another poignant demonstration of the provincial government's recognition of the 1923 Imperial Education Conference recommendations was found in the rest of the booklet where the course of study of French was outlined in great detail. Given the flexibility offered by the non-binding recommendations (cf. Whitehead, 2007), Alberta's autonomy in matters of Education could be affirmed.

In Alberta, not only did the *Instructions* cover the entirety of the primary course, providing a detailed curriculum from Grade One to Grade Eight, it did so entirely formulated in French. Grade by grade, section by section (reading, spelling, grammar, essay writing, and oral expression), this official document of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, including a synopsis of the French program, was entirely written in French in 1925. When compared with the problem that would arise two years later over the idea of French language town records, the significance of this provincial document written only in French is remarkable (e.g., *The Edmonton Bulletin*, March 17 1927, n.p.; *The Edmonton Journal*, March 8 1927, p. 16; March 17 1927, p. 7).

Moreover, given the UFA's own challenges and efforts in teacher education – a point in common with the 1923 IEC recommendations – and also given the pressure

building in Ontario for Bilingual Normal School, attention to teacher education in the *Instructions* is also significant. Within the *Instructions*' recommended list of teacher manuals, there was a work by Brunot, a methodology course book, like that offered in Teachers' Summer School at the University of Alberta. As such, while it did not establish a Normal School course for bilingual teachers, the province's Department of Education nevertheless underscored the importance of language education for bilingual schoolteachers, in accordance with the last IEC bilingual education resolution of 1923, as well as Sissons' observations from 1917 and the Leathes Report (1918).

Sissons (1917, p. 171) had effectively recognized in his treatise on bilingual education in Canada that for the Alberta government, "the important thing is the securing of competent bi-lingual teachers". As the *Instructions* were written in French, any teacher who might use them would be required to have a good academic knowledge of the language in order to follow the program. This might have helped avoid the potential problem of having less qualified teachers in bilingual schools, as had been found in Ontario and discussed in the Merchant Report (1912). In that situation, Dr. Merchant had stipulated that quality bilingual education depended on well-educated bilingual teachers.

The inferior quality of bilingual teacher education in Ontario was not corrected until 1927 when the *Report of the Committee Appointed to Enquire into the Condition of the Schools Attended by French-Speaking Pupils* (1927) was deposited by the Merchant-Scott-Côté Commission. This commission was a cooperative effort, uniting the Chief Director of Education, Dr. Merchant, with two other investigators: the French Canadian Catholic lawyer Louis Côté, and the Anglo-protestant Judge J. H. Scott. This led to the establishment of the first Normal School for bilingual French-English teachers, and the

abandonment of Regulation XVII that had incensed rather than solved the problem of bilingual schools in Ontario for 15 years.

In order to avoid inferior education in its bilingual schools, the Alberta government proceeded with caution and offered a compromise. The new provincial *Instructions* in 1925, coupled with the Summer School's French courses available at the University of Alberta, allowed the provincial Department of Education in Alberta to maintain its objective to have qualified teachers in provincial classrooms, whether they be in English or bilingual French-English schools.

The rich literary tradition of the French language, mainly from France but increasingly from Canada as well, facilitated French-English bilingual education in Alberta such as promoted in the IEC's recommendations in 1923. Resistance to bilingual education had not served Ontario well and the IEC represented an alternative approach. As the recommendations for bilingual education had not imparted clear delimitations regarding the meaning of "whole school course", the provincial government had further room to make its own interpretations. The Department of Education of the province of Alberta dismissed the fees and extended the one-hour daily French program to the entirety of the primary course, meaning until the eighth grade. These new provincial *Instructions* in 1925 loosely coincided with the Conference's recommendations of 1923. Moreover, these *Instructions* supported the ideal to keep students in school longer and provide educational assistance to rural communities, as had been promoted by the Liberal government in the UK and attempted by the UFA administration in Alberta. Throughout his tenure as Alberta's Minister of Education, Perren E. Baker would endeavour to promote the same ideals (cf. Wilson, 1977). As many bilingual French-English schools

were in outlying and agricultural French Canadian communities such as Legal, St. Isidore, St. Paul, Falher, or Morinville, these *Instructions* achieved these ends, while remaining relatively unknown or ignored by the teaching authorities associated with English-language schools.

In addition, an element of nature study was integrated into the course as a topic of oral exercises, and drawing was incorporated as an exercise in observation.

Coincidentally, the Leathes Report (1918) had encouraged the use of the modern language in writing, reading and speaking across a variety of topics. In Alberta, the new *Instructions* of 1925 effectively combined French language learning with other subjects of the curriculum. Such action had the added benefit of also curtailing possible criticisms that French study was another addition to an already heavy provincial curriculum and might get in the way of more practical learning.

The Reaction of the French-speaking Community in Alberta

Despite the additional daily hour in French study between the third and the eighth grade, this extension fell short of the aspirations of the French Canadian *chefs de file*. As a result, French Canadian interests in Alberta continued to advocate for more daily use of the French language and throughout Grades Nine to Twelve as well. With these objectives in mind, the *Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta* (A.C.F.A.) was founded in 1925-1926 and the *Association des instituteurs bilingues de l'Alberta* (A.I.B.A.) was also formed in 1926 (Mahé, 2002, p. 232). The A.I.B.A. would later be renamed the *Association des éducateurs de l'Alberta* (A.E.B.A.). Together, with the assistance of the French-speaking Catholic religious leaders, “provincial associations organized summer courses in the teaching of French, French Canadian History, and

Religion. Most of these courses were taught by members of the Catholic clergy (Jesuits and Oblates), and a few other religious orders” (Mahé, 2000, pp. 144-145). These courses were in addition to the province’s Department of Education’ Summer School for Teachers and reflected a sense of joint mission with the A.C.F.C. in Saskatchewan as of the late 1920s.

Among the French-speaking MLAs, C. L. Gibbs was particularly insistent that government money dedicated to teacher education ought to be shared with the Collège des Jésuites and other institutions that provided teacher education in French (*The Calgary Albertan*, March 9 1928, n.p.). An architect from England and provincial Labor Party politician, Mr. Gibbs was also a technical school instructor, and had developed a good sense of the larger educational picture in Alberta. Along with fellow Englishman John Barnett of the Alberta Teachers’ Alliance (A.T.A.), C. Lionel Gibbs was well versed in the British context and advances in education (Powell, 2013, n.p.). As such, Mr. Gibbs could speak to all the issues, from verifying the Alberta Agent-General’s progress in London to defending teachers’ rights in Alberta, while adroitly inserting a claim for French language education within his addresses in the Legislature (*The Edmonton Journal*, March 9 1928, p. 7; *The Calgary Albertan*, March 9 1928, n.p.).

In order to foster true bilingualism, more French was required throughout all grades of schooling. A “cultural resistance curriculum” as claimed by Mahé (2004, p. 186), was deemed necessary in order to maintain what little French was possible in the light of the continued ‘One Nation, One Language’ mindset that was still prominent among many government officials. Therefore, many teachers in bilingual schools

clandestinely opted to use textbooks from Québec (Gagnon, 1989, p. 102; Mahé, 2000, p. 148).

Through the use of the media, first *L'Union* and then the A.C.F.A.'s own newspaper, *La Survivance*, a province-wide coordination of French language education was slowly created and by 1933, the A.C.F.A. and A.I.B.A. had "prepared their first French Program of Studies" (Mahé, 2000, p. 149). According to Mahé (1997, 2000), before 1940, three quarters of the bilingual schools taught a variety of subjects in French, subjects that by law were to be taught in English. Moreover, of the two thirds of the bilingual schools in Alberta that took full advantage of the new *Instructions* prior to 1940, Mahé (1997, 2000) contended that 11% defied the educational authorities and spent more than the allotted one hour a day studying French. This coincides with Gagnon's (1989, p. 99) findings in reference to Edmonton's private school for girls, the Couvent de L'Assomption, established in 1926 by the teaching nuns, the Soeurs de L'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge, from Nicolet, Québec. "Although only one hour of French per day was allowed according to the educational provisions of 1925, the school offered all instruction in French" (Gagnon, 1989, p. 101). However, a large proportion of bilingual schools of this period either offered less French instruction than allowed or none at all, either because the teacher was not bilingual, or on account of the opposition from the non-French Canadian population and school trustees (Mahé, 1997, 2000).

Whereas the French language advocates' persistence would eventually succeed, this success would only grow little by little, over the course of the next seven decades. Years of hard work, sacrifice, and perseverance, ultimately paved the way for French

Immersion and Francophone education as of the 1970s as well as the 1980s and 1990s in the province.

In the midst of a particularly complicated decade in Alberta characterized by the election of the United Farmers of Alberta (UFA) as an alternative response to the traditional political party system, defiance of the federal government, and trying socio-economic circumstances, the French language question was especially present in matters related to education. As the provincial government had set out to improve the state of rural education, it already shared some of the same liberal ideals that had marked education reform in the UK. However, any action in favor of the bilingual question remained dangerous as it meant leaving the government open to attacks by most types of Canadian imperialists.

Closer identification with the heart of the Empire could, at minimum, lend an air of respectability to the UFA government via external validation (cf. Tepper) and protect it against slander. As important as political protection, the principles for bilingual education, approved at the Imperial Education Conference in 1923, provided a set of reference points that addressed the bilingual question within a government-run school system, based on similar liberal ideals that underpinned the education reforms in general. As such, the IEC recommendations in 1923 provided a window of opportunity (cf. Tepper, 2004, reference to Kingdon, 1984) for the elaboration of the provincial instructions detailing French language education for Francophones as of 1925 and these in turn provided a platform on which bilingual education could survive until conditions changed in Alberta.

Conclusion

The experiences of First World War evoked both good and bad feelings between English and French speakers in Alberta and throughout Canada. However, the hardships of the war and the military alliance between France and Great Britain encouraged friendships between old foes and ultimately, recognition for the value of bilingual education. After the war, the United Kingdom reviewed its schooling system, considered the recommendations of the Leathes Report (1918), and revamped its Education Act (1918). In Alberta, Dean Kerr and his colleagues not only made the Education Act (1918) more understandable to Edmontonians, they also endeavored to promote the initiatives of the Leathes Report (1918) on campus. Furthermore, the changes in the UK's language education prepared the way for the next Imperial Education Conference in 1923, where guidelines for bilingual education, reflective of the emerging Commonwealth, were approved and made known.

In Alberta, within a complicated socio-economic and political context, the UFA government had been inclined towards similar liberal inspired reforms in Education as in the UK. While also concerned for rural education reform, the provincial UFA government narrowly interpreted the IEC's bilingual education recommendations. While French language education was increased in a new set of *Instructions* issued by the Department of Education, it remained limited in many ways and fell short of French Canadians' aspirations. Viewing the provincial French program as a starting point, the French Canadian community of Alberta continued its organized effort to achieve better bilingual education in the province.

Chapter 11: Dean Kerr and the University of Alberta French Club and Debate Society Culture

At the turn of the 20th century, the French Canadian community in Alberta tirelessly worked to promote quality French language acquisition and use, much like other national minorities of the British Empire who also wished to have their first language not only protected but perpetuated in their societies. Increasingly, as of the end of the Boer Wars, and especially after WWI, members of the English-speaking majority lent the minorities their support. In Alberta, a foremost ally to the French Canadian community was Dean W.A.R. Kerr of the University of Alberta.

William Alexander Robb Kerr was a “man of particularly fine feeling, of kindly disposition, . . . most tolerant in his general attitude and generously appreciative of other people’s point of view ” and “of other faiths” (Macheachran, 1945, pp. 1-2). Originally from Ontario with a solid grasp of European history, Dr. Kerr’s “politics never affected his friendships nor did he become unduly ruffled in political discussions” (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). Dr. Kerr seems to have had much in common with missionary imperialists like Dr. Grant or his former supervisor Dr. Parkin, as described in Berger (1970/2013). However, whereas Grant and Parkin promoted Christian evangelization as the means to imperial unity, Kerr promoted bilingualism to foster Canadian unity.

Fluent in French as well as in German, Kerr had lived abroad in Paris and New York. After his arrival at the University of Alberta, Kerr also became the province’s Department of Education examination official for the two high school modern language options. In 1911, he was the sole examiner for both the French and German authors exams, as well as for the grammar, composition and sight translation exams in German

and in French (Department of Education 1911, Appendix H, pp. 168, 172, 195, 199).

While “he was at home in the field of modern literature . . . the music of his soul seemed to find a more spontaneous expression in the rhythm of the French language”

(Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). By the war’s end, Kerr had established an authentic relationship with the French Canadian community of Edmonton. Together, they worked for the advancement of French language education in this province, grounded in the knowledge that their struggle was not against the Empire per se, but against an Anglo-Ontarian interpretation of British imperialism and Canada’s role within it.

According to Gidney and Millar (2012, p. 215) the “imposition of unilingual schools, as well as the superiority of ‘British values’” were “in reality an invention of eastern Canadian loyalism” and they “went hand in hand with the creation of a national identity”. By the 1920s, a challenge had been issued to the unilingual nation-state as national policy proclaimed by Freeman and perpetuated in Alberta through the legacy of Sir Frederick Haultain through the means of public schooling shaped by Laurie’s views on second language pedagogy. The challenge of a new direction was issued from London via the IECs and student conferences that championed bilingualism and inclusiveness in the Empire/Commonwealth. In Alberta, the IECs’ ideals in regard to bilingual education were shared by Dr. Kerr.

Dr. Kerr and a number of his colleagues at the University of Alberta reflected the spirit of the Imperial Education Conferences of 1923 and of 1927. They also endeavoured to live up to the university’s responsibilities in modern language studies as related in the Leathes Report of 1918. Dean Kerr of the University of Alberta was an especially enthusiastic promoter of modern language studies, and an important and active ally of the

French Canadian community. Together with colleagues and students, he created an important public space that encouraged French and English speakers to meet, converse, and learn of each other while enjoying the French language. During the 1920s, many ideals concerning second language education as put forth in the Leathes Report in 1918 and recommended at the Imperial Education Conferences in 1923 and 1927 also characterized Dean Kerr's promotion of French language use and cultural exchange at the University of Alberta.

Dean Kerr of the University of Alberta used the institution to further the second language education ideals espoused in the U.K. as of 1918. These ideals had been shared with the Commonwealth at the subsequent Imperial Education Conferences, where unity had been promoted based on respectful association rather than imposed assimilation. Capitalizing on the presence of Edmonton's vibrant French language community comprised of doctors, lawyers, businessmen, members of the Legislative Assembly and City Hall, not to mention professional educationalists at the Juniorat St-Jean and the Collège des Jésuites, as well as his fellow faculty members at the University, Dean Kerr led the efforts that transformed a varsity club into an enriching linguistic experience without borders.

Faculty of the University of Alberta and the Promotion of the French Language

Given the multiple demands on Dr. Tory's time, including but not restricted to Khaki University, Dr. Kerr was entrusted with much university business, long before he himself had achieved the presidency of the University of Alberta (Macheachran, 1945, p. 2). In addition to President Tory, Dean Kerr had strong allies among his colleagues. Along with his responsibilities of the French Play, Professor Pelluet, originally from

Normandy, was an executive member of the French Club, as were Professor de Savoye and Professor Sonet. The latter, future head of the Modern Languages department, had been with the university since 1911 and had served as a liaison officer between British and French forces during WWI (Johns, 1981, p. 146). For his part, Monsieur de Savoye was very much engaged off campus, having become by 1927, the president of the Cercle Jeanne-d'Arc, a club with ties to the *Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta* (A.C.F.A.) and that promoted French language composition throughout all the French-English bilingual schools of the province in an annual writing competition (Lavallée, 1980; *L'Union*, March 17 1927a, p. 1).

Dr. Alexander not only subscribed to the local French language newspaper *L'Union*, which he reportedly enjoyed immensely, but he actively participated in the University of Alberta French Club, along with the aforementioned professors (*L'Union*, December 8 1927c, p. 1). The Dean of Agriculture, Dr. Howe, was a longtime advocate of agricultural education with a penchant for French Canadian culture. He was known to admire William Henry Drummond's dialect poetry such as *The Habitant* and recite such poems. When the Université Laval conferred onto him the title of Doctor of Science in Agriculture, Dr. Robert Newton wrote in *The Gateway* that "this additional link with old Quebec was particularly fitting" (Newton, *The Gateway*, October 5 1928, p. 1). A few months earlier, as tribute or just for fun, *The Gateway* had published an account of an imagined French Club meeting in varsity styled dialect poetry form (*The Gateway*, March 1 1928, p. 1).

Bilingualism via the French Club, the French Play, and the Debate Society

After the war, and throughout the 1920s, the University of Alberta French Club would prove to be instrumental as a meeting space for English Canadians and French Canadians on campus. The opportunities it afforded to interact and engage in French furthered the ideal of a continued and concurrent education in both languages while breaking down language barriers that, as Sissons (1917, p. 214) projected, would allow a progression of “mutual acquaintance”. By the decade’s end, Dr. Kerr’s additional French language publication would further serve to bridge the divide between English and French speakers in Alberta, and promote French language education for all.

The year 1920 marked the return of the French Play by the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Alberta. A customary event prior to the war, its return was “greeted with much enthusiasm” (*The Gateway*, March 11 1920, p. 2). The presentation became an occasion to invite together those learning the rudiments of the language as well as those who spoke it fluently in a social setting and provide an evening in French in Edmonton, something the university student newspaper would qualify over the years as a rare occurrence not to be missed.

The same year as the return of the French Play, the University of Alberta’s French Club was inaugurated, and according to the varsity newspaper, it was intended to encourage “students to make use of the expressions they learned in Kerr and Sonet’s French Grammar, or Graduated Lessons in French Conversation” (*The Gateway*, November 11 1921, p. 6). This French Club soon became the heart of the university French language experience, providing regular and authentic language exchanges between young people learning French as a second language on campus, Francophone

university students, and members of the French-speaking community at large. Under the leadership of Dean Kerr, the French Club was to be a defining characteristic of the University's efforts to enhance the French language learning experience for its students.

Members of the French Club would even contribute to *L'Écho du Collège*, the student newspaper of the French language Collège des Jésuites in Edmonton, and sometimes the college paper printed reviews of the University's French social evenings (*The Gateway*, January 8 1924a, pp. 1, 3). This was facilitated by the excellent relationship Dean Kerr nurtured with the Rectors of the Collège des Jésuites throughout his career. At a banquet in honour of the outgoing and incoming Rectors of the Collège des Jésuites, Dean Kerr expressed his admiration for the quality of their teaching as evidenced by their college graduates who became excellent university students (*L'Union*, May 10 1928, p. 1). The affiliation of the Collège des Jésuites in Alberta's capital with the Université Laval in Québec established further "outside validation" (Tepper, 2004, p. 531) of the excellent education provided at the local college (e.g., *L'Union*, August 25 1927, p. 8). Dean Kerr's promotion of the French language and involvement in the French language community ensured that the University of Alberta became another congenial option available to the French speaking classically educated Collège des Jésuites graduates in Edmonton.

The meetings of the University of Alberta's French Club would occur midweek, approximately twice a month. As the aim of the French Club was to bring people together, it was not uncommon to find notices and reviews of the French Club meetings in *The Gateway*, *L'Union*, as well as in the Ladies' Section of *The Edmonton Journal* throughout the 1920s (e.g., *The Edmonton Journal*, October 22 1923, p. 7). The French

Club meetings followed a simple format, beginning with a social tea in the late afternoon before the commencement of the formal part of the meeting. The topics varied according to the choice of the presenters and everyone in Edmonton was invited to attend. These meetings at set intervals, brought together different parties to learn of each other through formal presentations and social elements, all in the aim of promoting unity through French-English bilingualism.

Unity, Bilingualism and the French Club

Throughout the 1920s, French Club meetings displayed the vitality and range of the French language, demonstrating how appropriate and practical it was in the modern age, no matter the subject. Under Dean Kerr's leadership of the University of Alberta's French Club, there were multiple addresses over the years that justified, through humor, history, logic/reason, literature and heartstrings, claims for French-English bilingual education in Alberta.

Mr. C. Lionel Gibbs was often invited to speak at the French Club meetings. Welsh-born and Oxford-educated, the Edmonton-based architect and politician exuded charm in both languages, inspiring the younger Gibbs on campus, Eric and Gabrielle, as well as everyone else to follow suit. On one occasion Mr. Gibbs kept his audience laughing throughout his cautionary tale that highlighted the value of fluency in the French language. Upon the completion of their studies, he and his brother had ventured on a bicycle tour of France, only to find that their French language skills got them into more hot water than they had believed possible. Through a series of misadventures, the young men realized that their British education had left them entirely unprepared to face

the challenges of life in French outside the confines of their textbooks (*The Gateway*, January 15 1924, p. 1).

By 1926, a year following the province's Department of Education's new *Instructions* for French language education, Mr. J.A. Rioux, Secretary General of the A.C.F.A., was the invited speaker at the French Club meeting. The subject of that addressed was the very political problem of bilingual schools. Stressing that the time was right to dispel the language barrier between French and English language speakers, Mr. Rioux presented the bilingual school for all as the key to Canadian unity. The revisions to the curriculum, and updates to the hiring practices to include a French and an English language standard for teachers and school inspectors, would ensure that "every child would go out into the world with the same advantages, and without the fear of being misunderstood by his neighbours" (*The Gateway*, October 21 1926, p. 6).

The wording of the newspaper's article explaining Rioux' argument evoked the same hand in hand nation-building fraternity imagery depicted by Dr. Viljoen of South Africa at the Imperial Education Conference in 1923. Accordingly, the newspaper article concluded that when, through bilingual education, "the existing condition of 'unity and diversity' would be overcome, both races would be more sympathetic towards each other, and give each other their hands in a bond of true friendship, working together for the future of their common country" (*The Gateway*, October 21 1926, p. 6). Given the volatility surrounding the issue of bilingual schools throughout the country, the University of Alberta French Club provided a safe harbor in which to speak frankly and seek common ground on even the most controversial of subjects.

Unity, Bilingualism and French Canadian Literature

By the mid 1920s, in order to display the vitality of the language and the people who call it their own, the students at the University of Alberta were exposed to both classic French literature, as well as to little known or emerging French Canadian literature. This harmonized well with the efforts by the Canadian Authors' Association who had been trying to raise the profile of Canadian literature among students at this period (Tomkins, 1985/2008, p. 200). Tomkins (1985/2008) corroborates this decade with the introduction of English-Canadian content in the public schools as well.

Within a few years, students at the University of Alberta became more interested in literature centred on French Canada as evidenced when, in the special Christmas issue of 1926, *The Gateway* published a very lengthy article about a student's trip to Québec. The trip had been motivated by the characters and the backwoods setting from the novel *Maria Chapedelaine*, by Louis Hémon and published in 1913. The student, identified only by the initials L.N.H., was amazed to discover that the people and the places evoked in the storyline actually existed. Complete with a photograph of the legendary Peribonka River rapids that helped shape the story, the article reads like an awakening of the Anglo-Canadian spirit that had come to understand that pioneer French Canadians in Québec (or Alberta) were not so different from western Canadian (English-speaking) settlers (*The Gateway*, December 16 1926, pp. 1, 3). Coincidentally, the Leathes Report (1918) had encouraged modern language acquisition through literature and travel, just like L.N.H. had done. Whereas the report had centred on France for French language literature and travel, Dr. Kerr had adapted the recommendation to the local context and included

French-language literature that sparked an interest for Francophone destinations within Canada, thereby helping bridge what has often been called the two solitudes.

By 1927, French Canadian literature even more accessible to Edmonton students with the publication of an anthology of French Canadian prose literature spanning the years between 1845 and 1911, to be used in Alberta's schools (Kerr, 1927; *L'Union*, December 8, 1927c, p. 1; *L'Union*, January 26, 1928, p. 1). At that date, Dr. W.A.R. Kerr was Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Alberta, author of *A French Grammar* (1914), and *Officier de l'Instruction publique de la France* in recognition by the French Government for his efforts in promoting the French language. The same title was also conferred unto the Hon. Perren Baker in 1928 by the French government for his work in regard to French language education as Minister of Education in Alberta (*L'Union*, January 19 1928, p. 1).

Designed specifically for non-French speaking students, Dr. Kerr's newest publication nevertheless won acclaim throughout the provincial French-speaking population. Within the pages of *L'Union*, Dr. Kerr's *A Short Anthology of French-Canadian Prose Literature* was promoted as a must-have item in all French-speaking residences and it featured advertisements of the French-language bookstore, the Librairie Pigeon, as the place to acquire it (*L'Union*, January 26 1928, p. 1; February 9 1928, p. 2). In the announcement of "notre ami" Dr. Kerr's publication, *L'Union* stated that it wouldn't be surprising if their "compatriotes de langue anglaise arrivent à savoir écrire et parler " French as well or better than many French Canadians (*L'Union*, December 8 1927c, p. 1).

With the advent of Dr. Kerr's book, Sissons' (1917) proposal for all Canadians to learn about French Canadians, including their language, for the good of the country, became that much more of a possibility. According to Sissons (1917):

The French language we shall always have with us. It were good patriotism for Canadians . . . to adopt means to make themselves familiar with its idioms and literature. No citizen will find it a burden, but rather it will prove a door to wider opportunity in and a clearer knowledge of one's own country. (p. 214)

The Leathes Report (1918) as well as the recommendations of the Imperial Education Conference (1923) had echoed the same idea as Sissons (1917) in its promotion to learn to know about others through their language. Dr. Kerr had taken those ideals and done something practical. Unlike other books, Kerr's *Anthology* wasn't just for exercises in reading and fact gathering; it was a platform for conversation.

Bilingualism and the Debate Culture at the University of Alberta

As Sissons (1917) had recommended, there was growing interest among Alberta's English speakers to interact with French Canadians in French. By 1928, the numbers of the University of Alberta French Club had swelled to 165 members and it was becoming known as the Cercle Français. Elsie Young was vice-president of the University of Alberta French Club and Lucien Maynard was its president. The following year, they also performed in the French Play. As had often been the case throughout the 1920s, French Club members would also often perform in the annual French Play or partake in other French language activities, such as debates.

Dean Kerr had always understood that 'le français' was a living language, and therefore, a language to be used in public and private contexts alike. As such, French had

early on been integrated in the University's debates and mock parliamentary culture.

When varsity students went to the Legislature and performed all the required duties, they could do so with the additional element of making addresses and providing responses in French as well as in English.

In 1923, when the students discussed a variety of issues including the Imperial Conference, Miss Boyle made a speech in French in support of the government's railroad policy; in another session, a lively bilingual debate concerning immigration occupied much attention (*The Gateway*, December 4 1923, pp. 1, 3). This prompted the student paper to specify in its article that "speeches in French are to be encouraged and it is hoped that in the future members will take advantage of this feature" (*The Gateway*, December 4 1923, p. 1). In the following session, the student acting as Minister of Finance delivered his speech in French, and the only critique of this speech was not the language in which it was delivered, but whether or not it was acceptable to read a speech in the House (*The Gateway*, January 29 1924a, p. 1). University of Alberta students had even debated the value of bilingualism in schools. *The Gateway* reported how Miss Garrison most ably argued in favor of official bilingualism in a discussion concerning 'the bilingual question' (*The Gateway*, February 14 1922, p. 2).

The practical advantages of a better second language education were further proven by fellow debaters from England a few years later. When the Imperial Debate team toured western Canada, two of their members had wished to make a side trip, to get a better understanding of homestead life. When in St. Albert, the two Englishmen were reportedly able to partake in authentic conversation with their French-speaking hosts, as well as be engaged in a bilingual soirée of songs (*The Gateway*, March 4 1926, p. 1).

That event and the whole Imperial Debate team tour highlighted the common interests of university students throughout the Empire.

Unity and Bilingualism Fostered Through Larger Student Organizations

In December 1926, the National Federation of Canadian University Students (N.F.C.U.S.) was established in Montréal in order to better deal with the needs and challenges of university students, regardless of the geographic location, financial resources or language of their Canadian university. A year later at its first convention in Toronto, at which the University of Alberta was represented, the N.F.C.U.S. confirmed its “aims to further an understanding and the knowledge that will make better understanding possible among Canadian students” (Oke, *The Gateway*, January 12 1928, p. 3). This mission statement reflected the same spirit of collaboration as the IECs in 1923 and 1927.

Despite the language barrier between French and English language universities, the N.F.C.U.S. wanted to be inclusive. “The difficulty of language is always with us. The French-speaking student has great difficulty expressing himself properly in English. To the average – to the overwhelming majority of English-speaking students the reverse is impossible”, and yet, the NFCUS worked to coordinate activities between Canadian universities as well as promote student exchanges abroad. (Oke, *The Gateway*, January 12 1928, p. 3). As such the N.F.C.U.S. was affiliated with the National Union of Students (N.U.S.) in Great Britain and the Confédération internationale des étudiants (C.I.E.) in Europe. This demonstration of goodwill and partnership between the majority and the national minority was again reminiscent of the 1923 IEC and the 1927 IEC held a few months earlier. In all cases, there was a tangible effort made by the majority English

speakers to reach out to the formerly marginalized language groups and to treat them as equals.

At the N.F.C.U.S. Conference held in December 1927 at the University of Toronto, the focus to include both language groups did not end in the opening ceremonies when Mr. Jean LeSage from the Université de Montréal expressed “Good wishes from Canada’s French-speaking students” (*The Gateway*, January 19 1928b, p. 5). With the future view of establishing a “debate cycle” that would include “a debate in French at some of the universities” with a touring debate team from the Université de Montréal, the N.F.C.U.S.’ immediate goal was two-fold. Given that the N.U.S. had already sent an all-expense paid invitation to the N.F.C.U.S. to send a two-person debate team across the Atlantic, there was discussion in Toronto about the possibility of replying in kind (*The Gateway*, January 19 1928b, p. 5). In addition, there was much attention devoted to the organization of a debate tour of the Maritimes as well as a tour spanning central and western Canada, from Québec to British Columbia (*The Gateway*, January 19 1928b, p. 5). When the University of Alberta debate team took part in this latter tour in February 1929, it included stops in Ontario and Québec, being hosted by students at le Cercle Universitaire at the Université de Montréal and having great fun while taking part in a variety of French language events (*The Gateway*, February 21 1929, p. 6; February 28 1929, p. 1).

In December 1928, the second N.F.C.U.S. conference was held again in Ontario, this time in Kingston. Mr. Choquette from the Université de Montréal spoke in French on behalf of “the French-Canadian section of the Federation”, passing along wishes for a successful conference at Queen’s University, and emphasizing “that unity was the

essential goal to be sought” within the N.F.C.U.S. projects (Wilson, *The Gateway*, January 10 1929, p. 1). Much attention at this conference was directed to the formulation of a student exchange program between Canadian universities. Such exchanges emulated a common goal of the Imperial Education Conferences (1923, 1927) and the Leathes Report (1918), to promote greater familiarity about previously little known people and places.

Just as the Université de Montréal had hosted the inaugural meeting where the N.F.C.U.S. was established in 1926, it hosted the second Imperial Conference of University Students (I.C.U.S.) in September 1929. The first one of this series of conferences had been held in London and Cambridge two years earlier. The conference discussions dealt with student cooperation throughout the Empire, such as invitational events for debate teams and athletic teams. The conference also discussed issues pertaining to international student cooperation, and the progress of organizations devoted to this aim, such as the N.F.C.U.S. and the N.U.S.

As the appellation ‘Imperial Conference’ might denote, the matters that were discussed were similar issues to those discussed at the Imperial Education Conferences. Coincidentally, the student conference addressed “such items as Imperial education, interchange of students and teachers, circulation of information regarding University courses, student life in Dominions and India, textbook facilities, scholarships and loan schemes” (Cameron, *The Gateway*, November 21 1929, p. 4). The discussions at the main Imperial Education Conferences and these student conferences reflected similar concerns and conclusions that further conveyed the sense that the innovations put forth in London were shared by the youth across Canada.

Much like at the IECs, the point had strongly been made at the student conference that more knowledge of the geography, the people and the history of the diverse constitutive parts of the Empire should be taught in order to foster a greater understanding of one another throughout the Commonwealth. As such, the idea had circulated that Chairs of Imperial Relations ought be created in universities. It had been felt that this would have complemented the role of the universities in modern language studies, as formulated in the Leathes Report (1918). Moreover, the establishment of bursaries for students of the Mother Country to go study throughout the Commonwealth, was deemed as important as the established bursaries in the Dominions to go study in England or Scotland. For its part, the University of Alberta had even seen past the boundaries of the Commonwealth when it combined bursaries and bilingual education.

The establishment of a modern language bursary promoting further study in France enacted the very same ideals encouraged in the Leathes Report (1918), the IEC (1923) and the ICUS (1929). The French Government Bursary valued at 5000 Francs was first awarded in 1923 to Arthur Morgan, a University of Alberta graduate who had served in Belgium and France during the war, and who went on to study at the Univeristé de Paris and the Université de Grenoble (*The Gateway*, December 11 1923, p. 1). The following year the bursary was awarded to Ada A. Anderson to study at La Sorbonne (*The Gateway*, November 26 1924b, p. 2). Florence Borden had won three years later (*The Edmonton Journal*, July 30 1927a, p. 6). The expressed desire at the ICUS (1929) for more such travel and study bursaries throughout the Commonwealth illustrated a similar spirit of collaboration that animated the student conferences as the elder imperial conferences.

In addition, the Imperial Conference of University Students (1929) was noteworthy for two reasons. First, the Université de Montréal demonstrated to Donald Cameron, the University of Alberta delegate, as well as to the rest of the delegates that French Canadians could be as staunchly imperial-minded as anyone from the Commonwealth and just as welcoming too, if not more. This message was important to get across as many Anglo-Canadians of Loyalist mentality still adhered to the ‘One Nation, One Language’ ideal and saw bilingualism as a threat. Moreover, French Canadians, at least those in Québec, had often been seen as isolationists, wanting nothing to do with London save perhaps, access to the Privy Council (cf. Betcherman, 2002). Cameron’s remark of “the intense . . . rank, Imperialism of the French Canadian people” and “their magnificent hospitality” was not only high praise, it was an acknowledgement on the public record that French Canadians were just as worthy, valiant and admiring of British institutions as English Canadians, despite the differences in language and faith (Cameron, *The Gateway*, November 21 1929, p. 4; cf. Berger, 1970/2013).

In addition, this Conference showed that university students shared many of the same concerns and conclusions as their elders did at the Imperial Education Conferences. In regard to the perennial incentives that brought men to Canada from Britain, for example, it was agreed that there was always a need for good hardworking men. As these were needed as much in Britain as in Canada, the question remained, as it had always been since even before Rutherford’s meeting with education authorities overseas, about the type of men being sent to Canada (Cameron, *The Gateway*, November 21 1929, p. 4).

In 1923 and 1927, the British Empire had gathered and come to recognize differences, such as two languages, could be beneficial, and bilingual education was seen

in a favorable light. In 1929, the University of Alberta delegate remarked that “the [student] Conference... was the best thing that ever happened as far as developing a consciousness of unity in the quest of a common goal, namely, a broader viewpoint and better understanding on the part of all the students who had the privilege of attending” (Cameron, *The Gateway*, November 21 1929, p. 4). Given the interconnectedness between the Canadian universities and the N.F.C.U.S. and the N.F.C.U.S.’ focus on imperial exchanges and the student conferences, it is likely that many Canadian university student leaders were also aware of the Imperial Education Conferences and their recommendations. The discussion topics at the Imperial Conference of University Students in Montréal, as presented by Cameron (1929), and those discussed at the elder education conferences were so similar that a familiarity with the proceedings of past IECs would have been good preparation for the student conference. Given the news coverage of the IECs especially in *The Times*, the resemblances between the student delegates and their elders is understandable.

In October 1929, a month after the Imperial Conference for University Students, the University of Alberta Debate Society held its first meeting of the season. According to *The Gateway*, Elsie Young, Lucien Maynard, and Eric Gibbs dominated the debate. By the end of the 1920s, some of the most eloquent and convincing orators of the University of Alberta Debate Society were also longtime active members of the French Club. Steeped in a post-war British sense of renewed cultural awareness, as interpreted and enacted by Dean Kerr, these University of Alberta students were promoters of bilingualism, and poised to help shape the province’s future.

Conclusion

Integral to the Canadian experience in national student associations was the necessity to include difference: specifically, the French Canadian element. A major focus of the N.F.C.U.S. was the organization of a debate system that would integrate both the French and English speaking students across the country. This was a learned disposition that prepared Canadian students well for larger scaled meetings such as the Imperial Conference of University Students (1929).

At the University of Alberta, the debate culture promoted exchanges with other universities and was nourished by the effervescence of the French Club and its members. The local university students were regularly exposed to Dean Kerr's purposeful promotion of the French language as a practical and living language, and key to fostering understanding and good feelings between Canadians. The Debate Society would have been a natural outlet to this end.

Through his position at the University, and militant persistency, Dean Kerr had spearheaded the ideals of British education reform in Alberta, as expressed in the Leathes Report (1918), the Education Act in the UK the same year, and by the Imperial Education Conferences in 1923 and 1927. Dr. Kerr and his many allies created a safe harbor for French language education at the University of Alberta. In so doing, a post-secondary element, as well as a high profile alliance between French and English speakers, were incorporated into 'la survivance' and the struggle for bilingual education in Alberta. This cooperation had just become visible in *The Edmonton Journal* articles in 1923 and 1927. Moreover, this cooperation demonstrated a similar will as that expressed at the Imperial Education Conferences, and their recommendations for bilingual education.

The recommendations for bilingual education at the Imperial Education Conference (1923) represented an opportunity for the Dominions and Colonies to update their educational practices. The FCE/IECs offered governments the chance to foster more positive interactions between the state's majority and minorities, according to liberal ideals and with the support of the Commonwealth. The Imperial Education Conferences were key to the propagation of educational reforms that had redefined the norms in the UK. The strong commitment of the University of Alberta in British initiatives, such as Khaki University and practical modern language education, increased the strong association between Alberta and England. This inside track was a boon for the provincial government in its efforts to promote Alberta in London. Given the challenging context of post-war Alberta, as well as the changing mentality within the English-speaking community in the province, it made sense for the UFA government to modify the traditional nation-building assimilation policies in education and provide some measure of harmonization of their education reforms with the innovative Imperial Education Conference (1923) recommendations. *The Instructions concerning the teaching of French in the elementary schools of Alberta* (1925) offered limited French language education, but to the extent that they promoted bilingual education, they demonstrated a level of willingness by the provincial government to pursue ideals of education reform in a manner resembling the the recommendations of the Imperial Education Conference recommendations of 1923. The *Instructions* were also a major step towards a return to full-fledged sanctioned bilingual French-English education in the province over the course of the rest of the 20th century and beyond.

Chapter 12: The 1920s and Liberalism

This dissertation has looked at how a series of Imperial Education Conferences, especially the one in 1923, were key in promoting bilingual education within a liberal state and its public school system. While these conferences were occurring in London, England, an on-going struggle for bilingual French-English education was taking place in Alberta. During this same period, liberalism within the British Empire was in flux as people were trying to make sense of the evolving contexts of the end of the 19th century and dawn of the 20th century. At this time, group-differentiated rights came to characterize British liberal thinking according to Kymlicka (1995/2000). This chapter looks at how the Imperial Education Conferences in London and the events in Alberta are indicative of the importance of group differentiated rights in British liberal tradition as it pertains to public schooling. Will Kymlicka's arguments for group national minority rights within a liberal state will be used to help explain the legitimacy of the national minority claim for bilingual education within a liberal state, such as the claim for French-English bilingual education in Alberta.

Liberalism Broadly Defined

Public education in Alberta, like elsewhere in Canada, has reflected the designs of evolving liberalism throughout time. In broad strokes, Manzer (1994, p. 13) defined liberalism as espousing the ideals of equality of opportunity for individual material gain or self-development. Accordingly, it is acceptable that all individuals should have equal chances to achieve, and it is further understood that all achievements will not be equal. Liberalism promotes free enterprise and private ownership, but limits state intervention in individual lives. Whereas the stability of the state is important and should be supported,

the role of the state should be limited to coordination and ensuring parity in competition (Manzer, 1994, p. 13). Through public education, intervention of the liberal state ensures equality of access, recognized standards and the transmission of liberal ideals to the next generation.

Liberalism and Public Education in Canada in the Early 20th Century

Manzer (1994) identified three distinct waves of liberal thought in 150 years of Canadian public education: political liberalism in the mid 19th century, economic liberalism at the turn of the century, and ethical liberalism as of the 1960s. For Manzer (1994), whereas political liberalism perceived public education as a low-cost mass delivery system for a common set of basic skills and civic values in accordance with the state, ethical liberalism in public education valued investment and diversification in education that promoted the development of the whole person according to their potential and interests. In contrast, economic liberalism viewed public education as a means to promote the political status quo and prepare future citizens for the workforce. In this context, a practical education facilitated individual success on which relied the state's economic prosperity and political stability (Manzer, 1994). While business interests were not the whole point of education, their significance required that they be included in educational aims if the education was to be useful and relevant (Leathes Report, 1918).

By the time public education was formalized in the Northwest Territories in the late 19th century, political liberalism in public education was making way for economic liberalism that dominated much of Canada until the 1930s (Manzer, 1994, p. 96). This coincides with the timeline under study. Economic liberalism did not refute political liberalism as much as it further recognized and promoted the interests of industry and

individual gain as key to the prosperity and stability of the state. Within an economic liberal democratic society, Manzer (1994, p. 96) identified three roles of public education: to configure future citizens in the national culture, to provide a safeguard for the society's political institutions, and to respond to the needs of the workplace. Accordingly, public education assured the development of individual potential that in turn would reproduce the socio-economic order and sustain society's prosperity and political stability.

Social Unity, Citizenship Education and Public Schools in a Liberal State

National or social unity was closely linked to a state's stability. Kymlicka (2001, p. 311) has asserted that social unity rests on more than just agreed political principles but also on a sense of co-membership between citizens of a state. Shared membership is the feeling of belonging with other citizens in a polity (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 311). As such, shared membership is integral to social unity and social unity has been the cornerstone of nation-building projects through the means of public education.

However, as pointed out by Gidney and Millar (2012, p. 215), the path to social unity for many English-Canadians with a loyalist mindset was one of exaggerated reverence for British values and their believed necessity of a unilingual English language schools for all under the banner 'One Nation, One Language'. Armed with Freeman's principle of assimilation to ensure political stability and economic prosperity, and Laurie's valuation of second language learning within the public school system, the McCarthys, the Goggins, the Haultains, and the Boyles of the land did their best to impose their idea of social unity in the Canadian Prairie, not the least of which in Alberta. Social unity was the reason that public education had been the focus of so much attention

of both the territorial government of the 1890s and subsequent provincial government of Alberta as of 1905. Social unity was the *raison d'être* of the *Alexandra Readers* in Alberta, complete with inspiring images and tales of British heroism. Even the wartime enlistment was a means of social unity. However, the approach to social unity changed after the Great War, as evidenced by the educational and social reforms of the Lloyd George government in the UK and the Imperial Education Conferences. Whereas social unity was once thought to be achievable by imposition and assimilation, during the 1920s social unity efforts were characterized by accommodation and inclusion.

Throughout the 19th century and into the 20th century, citizenship education within the public schooling experience emphasized the glorious moments of the state's history, thereby endearing the political institutions and traditions of the state. This emphasis in education promoted what has been referred to as 'unreflective patriotism' where other states, their histories and their adherents, were presented as being outdone in comparison (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 310). Such an ethnocentric approach in British education was pervasive and discouraged a questioning mindset. "This sort of civic education . . . promoted passivity and deference, not a critical attitude towards political authority or broad-mindedness towards cultural differences" (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 310). Unreflective patriotism required a simple rhetoric of basic facts about government function, but nothing more that might stimulate thinking about the reasons supporting the status-quo (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 310).

Unreflective patriotism could be understood as both the basis and the objective of Professor Laurie's pedagogy for second language learning, known throughout the British Empire and promulgated by the Department of Education in Alberta during the first

quarter of the 20th century. Accordingly, the selected foreign language was to be learned in order to access the foreign culture via its literature, not in order to speak with the people and negotiate differences. A second-language learning approach bereft of personal interactions with native speakers of the target language further reduced the opportunity for any challenging idea to threaten the established mindset of the majority.

The more homogeneous the population in a state, the easier it is to achieve a feeling of shared membership because of commonly held traditions, culture, and language. Language is particularly important to the ideal of a nation state because, as Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 111) has pointed out, a state cannot function without the use of a commonly held language. However, by choosing one common language for public life, the state is effectively facilitating the dominance of that language at the expense of the others. “When a government decides the language of public schooling, it is providing what is probably the most important form of support needed by societal cultures, since it guarantees the passing on of the language and its associated traditions and conventions to the next generation” (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 111). Social unity, then, may be the basis for establishing an official language and the public school becomes the means by which the state ensures that everyone learns the official language.

Through the official language, public schools are tasked with the preparation of future citizens. Citizens are people in the state that have a responsibility to uphold the political system and institutions through their acquired dispositions, virtues and loyalties, as manifested either through public political engagement and/or by other choices they make in their daily lives (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 293). Whereas the public school is not the only institution that socializes children in citizenship education, the public school is an

essential part of this socialization (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 293). The public school, then, becomes very important to nation-building projects in states that are characterized by a heterogeneous population. Not only does it promote the acquisition of a common set of ideals, it does this through the acquisition of an official language.

National Minorities, Official Languages and Shared Membership in a Liberal State

For liberal thinkers like John Stuart Mill, a nation state was essential and could not happen without a common shared nationality (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 52). Assimilation of minorities into the established dominant social fabric was encouraged (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 55). That position had been reflected in Professor Freeman's treatise, and other proponents in Canada such as Dalton McCarthy. Like Mill, Professor Freeman accepted assimilation as a viable option to promote the nation state, as popularized by McCarthy and others in Canada by the motto: 'One Nation, One Language'. The justification for this way of thinking was that a multination state was less liable to be stable as compared with a nation state (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 50). As such, liberal thinkers like John Stuart Mill "believed there should only be *one* official culture" (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 54, author's emphasis).

The problem with having one official culture, or language, in a multination liberal state, is not one of contesting political principles, but one of shared membership. As seen in Kymlicka (2001, p. 311), national minorities may adhere to the same principles as the majority, but lack the feeling of being part of the same team. Past efforts to assimilate them have provoked resistance and opposition. While immigrant populations who have sought out a new life in a new land have been found to be somewhat accepting of the

public school's assimilation objective, national minorities have opposed this objective (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 312-313).

Kymlicka (1995/2000) stated that national minorities were different from other groups in a multination state. For Kymlicka (1995/2000, pp. 116-117), national minorities came to be present in the state either without choice, or by choice but under a certain understanding. As such, they don't necessarily identify with either the majority or the other ethnic groups. French Canadians in the Northwest Territories circa 1880s and in Alberta after 1905 had resisted the public school system's imposition of the English language. While they espoused liberal political principles, even participating at all levels of government, they contested the idea that bilingual education was a threat to the state's stability and prosperity.

French-English bilingual education in Alberta has presented a challenge for policymakers since the arrival en masse of English-speaking settlers from Ontario and their efforts in favour of a public education system at the close of the 19th century, prior to the establishment of the province (Aunger, 1998; Aunger, 2001). This was indeed the case at the turn of the century in the Council of Public Instruction of the Northwest Territories, with the Superintendent of Education, D. J. Goggin. During the tenure of Superintendent Goggin, Roman Catholic and French language schools were absorbed into the public education structure that was dominated by the English-speaking majority who believed that secular schools were optimal. After the creation of the province of Alberta in 1905 and Premier Rutherford's appropriation of the education portfolio as Minister of Education, the education model inspired from Ontario was maintained. This continued the tutelage of minority Roman Catholic education and minority French

language schooling under the authority of a Department of Education regulated by the Anglo-Protestant majority.

As evidenced in the example of Alberta, Manzer (1994, p. 173) has observed that in economic liberal Canada, the first quarter of the 20th century was characterized by a series of regional linguistic and religious regimes. According to Manzer, (1994, p. 258), Roman Catholic education rights were respected in public education. Moreover, English was deemed the language of the majority in Alberta and the efforts to assimilate the non-English speaking populations promoted an Anglo-Canadian identity that emphasized strong British ties (Manzer, 1994, pp. 173-174). In this regime, French was “permitted in elementary schools as a transitional language of instruction” and Manzer (1994) stated that this was maintained without interruption until the 1960s when education became imbued with ethical liberalism characterized by a focus on the person’s full potential (Manzer, 1994, p. 174). While Manzer (1994) presented a general picture of French language education in Alberta, he ignored the subtle nuances in liberal thought during the 1920s and the changes they incurred in the province’s French-English bilingual schools.

According to Kymlicka (1995/2000), minority rights did not rise to recognition in liberal discussions for the first time as of the 1960s. Instead, the liberal tradition had already been heavily invested in the challenge posed by minority rights throughout the 19th century and during the interwar period, immediately after the First World War, prior to resurfacing again later in the 20th century (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 50). Kymlicka’s observation is upheld in Alberta’s history when, during the mid 19th century in what was to become Alberta, French, English and at times even Cree was used in Catholic schools and in government until the advent of large numbers of settlers from Ontario and

immigrants from the United States and Europe (Aunger, 1998; Aunger, 2001). During the 1920s in Alberta, there was also a renewed attention to French language education.

The turn of events in western Canada in the late 19th century signaled the reversal of fortunes for national French Canadian minorities. Once the French Canadians had become outnumbered in the Northwest Territories, minority language rights were cast aside, and English was imposed in all public life under the Haultain government (Aunger, 1998; Aunger, 2001). This change displayed an unreflective patriotic, ethnocentric view by the majority that justified assimilation in order to establish the desired nation state, and ensure the stability and prosperity of the state.

Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 53) has observed that the treatment of the national minorities has depended on whether they were perceived as associated with major nations such as Germany or France, or whether they were deemed less important nationalities like the Welsh. To be perceived as a lesser nationality increased the likelihood of being designated for assimilation. Assimilation entailed the loss of those elements that made a group distinct – language, culture, institutions, religion – as it was blended into the majority group.

A popular view since the fateful Battle on the Plains of Abraham in 1759, but especially since Lord Durham's report at the time of the Rebellions in 1837-38, portrayed French Canadians as backward or unsophisticated, in comparison to the French in France. According to Berger (1970/2013, p. 57), among adherents of the Canada First movement in the 1860s-1870s, French Canadians were deemed lowly "traitors" following the "resistance in the Red River settlement" and "the shooting of the Orangeman, Thomas Scott". At best, the Canada Firsters saw the French Canadian in western Canada as

unproductive, a weak link in the Dominion's defence against American invasion, and incapable of true (British-centered) Canadian nationalism (Berger, 1970/2010, p. 5-59). MacFarlane (1999, p. 17) revealed that at the dawn of the 20th century, French Canadians were perceived as "an inferior population speaking a foreign tongue". In Cook (1963), Dafoe's portrayal of the French Canadian is one of a sullen figure, with isolationist views, and cannot be a true Liberal. As such, he is eternally suspect. In contrast, Dafoe is also reported to have so enjoyed Paris in 1918 that he took the opportunity to return, and made no negative comment when Mackenzie King practiced his written French (Cook, 1963).

In the Anglo-dominant culture of the Canadian Armed Forces of the early 20th century, the negative view of French Canadians was especially engrained, according to Pariseau and Bernier (1986) who have written extensively on the subject. The history of the 233rd Battalion Canadiens-français du Nord-Ouest (CEF) based in Edmonton provides a case in point. According to Pagé (2015, pp. 7, 9), Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank's final inspection found that the 233rd Battalion's commanding officer from Montréal was underqualified, despite this officer's 18 years in the 65th Regiment, and his participation in the 14th Battalion. Moreover, Pagé (2015, p. 9) reported that the final inspection of the 233rd Battalion also revealed that the educational level of most of the men was deemed inferior to the norm. It is unknown if this was in fact the case and if so, if it was specific to that battalion, or if it was generalized to all enlistees from largely agricultural areas, regardless of language. The latter possibility echoes a similar observation made in Noël (2012) in regard to the state of education in rural schools in Ontario, both French and English.

It is also possible that the dismal inspection report was simply more evidence of bias against the establishment of a French Canadian battalion from western Canada – a factor that had delayed the authorization of all French Canadian units in WWI according to Pariseau and Bernier, (1986) as well as Pagé (2015). MacFarlane (1999, p. 20) stressed that Ernest Lapointe, MP for Kamouraska, Québec, blamed “the government for not doing enough to ensure voluntary enlistment” among French Canadians. As shown in Parizeau and Bernier (1986), and Cook (1963), the growing perception by English-speaking Canadians that French Canadians were not fulfilling their military responsibilities during the Great War engrained bitter resentment between both groups. The following headlines portray the situation: “People asked to help spot all slackers” (*The Edmonton Bulletin*, March 1 1918, p. 3); “French Canadians are not slackers” (*The Edmotnon Bulletin*, February 15 1918, p. 5). Given the importance of militarism in English Canadian imperialism according to Berger (1970/2013), it is no surprise that any hesitancy to sign up was tantamount to treason in MacFarlane (1999, p. 20).

French Canadian uncouthness was often associated with their speech. There was derision vis-à-vis the French language spoken by French Canadians and claims that it wasn’t even French at all, but a deviation. The critiques in regard to the quality of education in French-English bilingual schools like in Ontario did not help dispel this perception. Such was the popularity of these notions in Edmonton that in 1924 and in 1929, Fr. LePage and U of A Law student Lucien Maynard respectively confronted the issue of language versus patois in their addresses to the Univeristy of Alberta French Club (*The Gateway*, March 27 1924, p. 1; January 31 1929, p. 6). A few years earlier, Miss Garrison had argued in a debate that French Canadians possessed every trait

associated with a nation (*The Gateway*, February 14 1922, p. 2). This was further supported in 1928 when Elsie Young returned to campus from a summer teaching in the French Canadian town of St. Paul, Alberta, and professed her deeper understanding of French Canadian aspirations and the legitimacy of bilingualism in Canada (*The Gateway*, November 23 1928, p. 1).

The discourse upheld by Maynard, Young and others contrasted Lord Durham's report that claimed that French Canadians were bereft of literature and all such things that would make them a nation, let alone a respectable one. Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 55) remarked that Lord Durham's report had even found approval by John Stuart Mill. For Mill, forced or coercive assimilation of a national minority within a state could be a necessary step in establishing a common sense of nationhood and achieve a nation state (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 73). In early 20th century English Canada, Lord Durham's 19th century view that French Canadians were fit only for assimilation still attracted many adherents.

By the turn of the 20th century, following decades of turmoil, liberal thought in the British Empire was showing signs of change. In a speech lauding the Canadian soldier's popularity among the foreign nations during the war, Dr. Tory, President of the University of Alberta, also revealed that:

The only way to ultimate peace . . . is by appreciating and respecting the traditions of other races both in politics and in religion. The futility of trying to extinguish a nation's tradition was shown after the British occupation of New France, when no coercion could make the French Canadians abandon their own traditions and adopt those of the British. (*The Gateway*, November 5 1924, p. 4).

Tory's speech had been informed by the experience of the Great War and paralleled the changing attitude apparent in educational circles in London, England, prior to the war. At the Federal Conference on Education (1907), followed by the Imperial Education Conference (1911), an emerging discourse supporting bilingual education reflected a changing attitude towards the national minorities within the Empire. The First World War not only saw a bilingual Welsh native speaker as Prime Minister of the UK defend British interests, it coincided with a recognition for social reforms that included a change in educational policy. After the war, Dr. Tory was reported to have observed that delegates to the IEC were less defensive and territorial and more willing to share experiences (Stephenson, 2010). A few years later, renewed emphasis on accommodation of national minority language rights was clearly proclaimed at the Imperial Education Conference in 1923 and expanded upon in 1927. Kymlicka (1995/2000) saw this interwar period as a renaissance of national minority rights liberal discourse, and he has argued that such a shift was a legitimate extension of liberal thought.

Arguments in Favor of National Minority Rights in a Liberal State

Kymlicka (1995/2000) has made a strong case for the possibility of group differentiated claims within the liberal tradition. His arguments confer a fresh meaning to the 1923 Imperial Education Conference recommendations on bilingual education and the efforts to promote French language education and use in Alberta during the 1920s. In order to ensure equality of all citizens, Kymlicka (1995/2000, Chapter 6) maintained that a liberal state has a responsibility to accord some group rights to national minorities. Moreover, he has explained that group differentiated rights were not only consistent with liberal thought, but were at the heart of liberal thinking, citing the citizenry as a

differentiated group that enjoys special rights within a state (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, pp. 124-125).

While national minorities correctly invoke historical reasons for their rights, Kymlicka (1995/2000, pp. 119-120) has claimed that the past requires interpretation and as such, minority rights simply based on historical reasons alone do not present a guarantee of respect. In addition to the equality argument however, historical claims become more compelling. Furthermore, the liberal majority's own self interest to have diversity within its midst, is another reason that is at the core of the liberal logic. In conjunction with the equality argument, the self-interest of the majority as well as the historical claims of the minority can alter the way minority rights are accommodated within a liberal society (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 123). In the 1920s, the equality argument prevailed at the Imperial Education Conferences. The equality argument combined with the self-interest of the majority as promoted by a few key members sustained the French Canadian historical claims in the 1920s. The *Instructions for French language education* issued by the Department of Education of the province of Alberta in 1925 are illustrative of the liberal equality argument as it pertained to group differentiated rights according to Kymlicka (1995/2000).

National Minority Rights in a Liberal State Based on the Equality Argument

Kymlycka (1995/2000, p. 108) has made the case that a state's choices have far-reaching impact, even if the choice is to do nothing at all. In particular, the choice of an official language guarantees its transmission to the next generation and continued use throughout the public sphere (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 111). Kymlicka (1995/2000) would agree with Aunger (1989b; 2002; 2008) and Martel (2001) who recognized that

official language status grants that language a power and a prestige that is exclusive and not shared with all other languages. The refusal of the state to recognize a minority's official language status excludes the minority language from public life and ignores the equality of the minority language with the other official language.

This was what happened to the French language in the Northwest Territories in 1892 with Haultain's Resolution, and again in 1988 when the provincial government confirmed this action. Not only had French been denied its historically granted official language status in the Northwest Territories Act (1877), but, the language had become barred from public life, including schools. As Kymlicka (1995/2000) so aptly observed, "One of the most important determinants of whether a culture survives is whether its language is the language of government Refusing to provide public schooling in a minority language . . . is almost inevitably condemning that language to ever-increasing marginality" (p. 111). This is why French Canadians in the Northwest Territories in 1892 and in Alberta after 1905 had constantly sought government assistance to redress this injustice. It was a matter of national minority cultural and linguistic survival, it was the 'la survivance'.

Kymlycka (1995/2000, p. 108) acknowledged that some liberals have not wished to interfere with the cultural market, under the pretext that benign neglect is the proper governmental response to national minority language right claims. Kymlicka (1995/2000) has argued that this response ignored the reality that the state had already skewed the cultural market when it chose and sanctioned the other (majority) language. According to Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 109) a state's action cannot ever be a form of benign neglect towards a national minority, because far from being neutral, this absence of help does

hinder the national minority's development. Left without assistance, the national minority is vulnerable to decisions made by the majority and is dependent on the majority's goodwill, deep understanding, and foresight. As the majority does not have to deal with such conditions, it is only fair that external protections are granted to the national minority (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 109). Otherwise, benign neglect becomes a strain on cultural membership and such inequality becomes "a serious injustice" (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 109).

Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 110) has remarked that circumstances and timing play a role in the legitimacy of national minority claims. The experiences of WWI, in addition to the experiences within the Empire the century before, had unsettled the imperial mindset and challenged assumptions. The hostilities had given rise to reflection about the nature of the imperial bond and the relationship between English speaking and non-English speaking populations. Moreover, the linguistic shortcomings in British education had been made evident within the context of the military alliance with France, and reflected in Canada within the context of its military organization and French Canadian recruitment for military service (see Pagé, 2015; Parizeau & Bernier, 1986). The success in second language education in South Africa and Wales, repeatedly discussed at the Imperial Education Conferences and the latter mentioned in the Leathes Report (1918), touched upon not only language acquisition but national unity as well. At a time of social upheaval throughout the world, when the value of cooperation versus confrontation was increasingly popular, the idea of bilingualism as a salve for social membership was enticing.

In the post-war Imperial Education Conference discussions, bilingualism was presented as key to peaceful co-existence and social integration, as opposed to linked to state instability. Rather than perceived as source of division within a state, bilingualism was becoming accepted as a way to bound a state together. By 1923, the conditions were ripe to officially sanction bilingual education at the Imperial Education Conference. While the Conference recommendations did not have rule of law, they clearly indicated the new imperial attitude and provided guidelines that multination states could follow. By encouraging the imperial member states to accommodate national minorities in their regions with bilingual education, the imperial bonds would be strengthened.

Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 112) has critiqued the governmental approach to push the decisions of language policy to the local level of governments. By leaving linguistic related policies to be determined region by region, the national minorities would only be assured just treatment where they formed a majority of the population. As such, Kymlicka (1995/2000, pp. 112-113) expressed concern about the ensuing blurring of the lines between national minority rights and the rights of the majority. Rather than address the issue of national minority rights, the context is modified to make a minority the majority where possible. Whatever linguistic accommodation they achieve, therefore, is on account of their group numbers, not because of governmental recognition of the nature of their group.

Kymlicka's concern explains the problem with the provincial *Instructions for French language education* in Alberta. When the federal government had abandoned its role in enforcing official bilingualism in the Northwest Territories in 1892, it left the French Canadian national minority in the hands of the Territorial Assembly, a regional

and more local level of government that was not interested in maintaining bilingualism. In 1925, when the provincial government finally increased the permissible amount of French language education, the increase was severely limited in scope. By designating the program for Francophone students only, the Alberta government was actually limiting this program to where the French Canadian population represented the majority of the school student body. Sometimes it worked out in places like St. Paul, Alberta, where Elsie Young went to teach for a summer and came to understand the value of French-English bilingual education within the British Commonwealth (*The Gateway*, November 23 1928, p. 1). However, this was an exception rather than the rule. Given the widespread distribution of French Canadians throughout Alberta, they only formed the majority of the population in certain areas. Therefore, a significant portion of the French Canadian population in Alberta was not able to access French language education in their public schools. As a result, private boarding schools were maintained by the French-speaking religious teaching orders so as to provide an education to a French Canadian student body stemming from farms or towns, near and far.

The French language Catholic private boarding schools were advertised in *L'Union* and promised a bilingual education that followed the curriculum of the province's separate schools (meaning Catholic publicly-funded schools). In the French language Catholic boarding schools where boys and girls were admitted, the boys could only attend until age ten or eleven, such as the Pensionnat de l'Immaculée-Conception in Vegreville, Alberta (*L'Union*, September 25 1919, p. 2). After that, the boys could attend the Juniorat St-Jean in French with the Oblates. Alternatively, they could attend the Collège des Jésuites where the bilingual education offered included the commercial

courses and the classic course (*L'Union*, September 25 1919, p. 2; *L'Union*, August 25 1927, p. 8).

Edmonton's Collège des Jésuites had an understanding with the Université Laval so that the *collégiens* from Alberta could go to university in Québec (*L'Union*, August 25 1927, p. 8). A similar arrangement with Laval allowed girls who finished their education within the private Catholic and officially bilingual Couvent de L'Assomption d'Edmonton to attend university in Québec (Gagnon, 1989, pp. 99-101). Although there was no evidence found of a comparable association with the Université de Montréal, that institution's advertisements within the western French language press to attract candidates to its veterinarian school acknowledged the quality of education of potential candidates (*L'Union*, August 11 1921, p. 2).

While all these opportunities were available, access depended on each student's financial situation. The financial burden of out of province post-secondary education in French, or even French language private boarding school education within the province, could further impede the access to bilingual education for families on isolated rural homesteads or from the urban working class, as discussed by Gagnon (1989). The rate of Francophone assimilation remained problematic for the French Canadian minority in Alberta during the 1920s.

The Imperial Education Conferences had no legal jurisdiction to make their will binding. Moreover, the Canadian government had yet to access and have a role in the provincial realm of education in order to further encourage French-English bilingual schooling. In Alberta "decisions about language" were necessarily left to "political

subunits” (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 112). This created an unjust situation whereby the national French Canadian minority was disadvantaged:

In a democratic society, the majority nation will always have its language and societal culture supported, and will have the legislative power to protect its interests in culture-affecting decisions. . . . Hence group-differentiated self-government rights compensate for unequal circumstances that which put members of the minority cultures at a systematic disadvantage in the cultural marketplace . . . (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 113).

Bilingual education was not deemed a right but an option, and in many circumstances, it wasn’t even an option.

In 1920s Alberta, the right to self-governing, Francophone, publicly funded schools was seventy years away. The allowance of 80% of the school day in French for Francophone or Anglophone students was still over fifty years away. In the absence of such legislation and regulations, French-English education in Alberta has relied on what Kymlicka (1995) has referred to as the historical argument as well as the diversity argument. These arguments in addition to the equality argument have explained how French-English bilingual education was logically supported in this provincial liberal state.

The Historical Argument for National Rights in a Liberal State

Historically, French was the first European language spoken in what is now Alberta (Alberta Culture and Tourism, n.d., online). The advent of the French-speaking missionaries, nuns, and pioneers on the heels of the voyageurs established the French language in schools. The linguistic representation in the early territorial government

councils as well as in territorial government publications further entrenched the French language in public life. Moreover, the Northwest Territories Act (1877) confirmed the bilingual French-English nature of the state. However, this history was followed by the inundation of non-French speaking settlers in the Northwest Territories, the abolition of French from public life in 1892, the School Ordinances of 1901 relegating French to a foreign language status, and the passing of the Alberta Act in 1905 recognizing English as the sole official language. As such, the historical argument in favor of French-English bilingual schooling rights was confronted with the historical argument in favor of English unilingual schooling in Alberta and the point seemed moot. The refusal of the majority to recognize the French Canadian minority's language rights at this time confirms Kymlicka's observation that the weakness of the historical argument lies in the dependency on the majority's favorable interpretation of the minority's claim. As such, the historical argument is best when combined in addition to the equality argument (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 120).

Bilingual education in other parts of the British Empire was gaining favor and talk of these experiences started to be shared within the British world as early as the Federal Conference in Education in 1907. At the following conferences in 1911 and 1923, proper discussions on the subject ensued, even addressing the concerns of the psychological effects of bilingualism. The idea that bilingualism posed a threat to intellectual development could cast an ominous shadow on nation-building aspirations. However, this threat became dubious in light of the continued and overwhelmingly positive experiences in bilingual education in Wales and South Africa. The longstanding bilingual experiments in these areas of the Commonwealth contradicted much of the psychometric-based

American research in bilingualism and gave credence to the increasing number of contemporary studies that had found bilingual education to be safe and possibly beneficial to students. As such, continued research on the subject was agreed upon in 1923 and this disposition was included in the preamble of the conference recommendations for bilingual education in 1923.

Since then, as evidenced in this project's literature review, bilingual education research in academic performance and intellectual development has not stopped. Moreover, it has shaped the vast amounts of work done, especially in regard to the French Immersion pedagogy that first took root in Canada in the 1960s, and in Alberta as the 1970s. In addition to this disposition, the recommendations from the 1923 Conference also served to appease fears about bilingual education. The Welsh experience had clearly demonstrated that proper bilingual education could yield positive results. The State of South Africa had established their public education system on that premise. Closer to home, Dr. F. W. Merchant had come to the same conclusions in his first report predating Regulation XVII. He would come to the same conclusions in his tripartite report in 1927. During the inter-war period, liberal thinking was again open to the idea of accommodating the needs of minorities. The liberal "virtue of having a diversity of lifestyles within a culture" might therefore include the diversity afforded to the state by its national minorities (Kymlicka, 1995/2000, p. 121). Given the difficulty of the historical argument, namely its dependency on interpretation by the majority to promote the minority's interests, added incentive to accommodate the national minority within a liberal framework can make all the difference.

Following the war, under the leadership of the bilingual Prime Minister Lloyd George, the UK embarked on a series of social reforms to provide assistance to some of the most vulnerable of society: children, women and the working class. In true liberal tradition, the objective of these reforms was to provide extra support to differentiated groups who required it in order to allow everyone the opportunity to better participate in society. Education was a focal point. “The practical aim of education is to enable men to live as individuals and as citizens. The idealistic aim of education is to enable men to live better” (Leathes Report, 1918, p. 46). The UK’s Education Act (1918) was deemed progressive and was quick to make headlines everywhere, including in Alberta where the provincial government was also keen to make similar changes to its education system. Among the education reforms studied in the UK, the Leathes Commission had reviewed options to improve second language learning. The Leathes Report (1918) argued that in addition to English, a deep knowledge of one living language would be more beneficial to both the individuals and society than a superficial knowledge of several. Moreover, the report further favored French as an excellent second language to master after English.

The implications of the Leathes Report (1918) for bilingual education on the prairies was the subject of an article in Saskatchewan’s *Le Patriote de l’Ouest* and readily available in Alberta as well. Whereas the article in *Le Patriote* aptly presented the national French Canadian minority’s favorable view concerning the report’s position, it was the English Canadian majority view that held sway in Alberta.

In Edmonton, Dean Kerr became a galvanic force for the promotion of French language education and its practical uses in Alberta after the war. In 1921, in words highly reminiscent to those used in the Leathes Report (1918) description of the value of

French, Dean Kerr said that not only did the study of the French language and civilization occupy an important place at the University of Alberta; but that no education was complete without their study (*L'Union*, August 18 1921, p. 8). Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Alberta, Dr. Kerr and the Department of Modern Languages, lost no time in re-establishing the traditional French Play, in organizing the French Club and using these activities to open the university campus up to the public, including the French Canadian community. Dr. Kerr's vision of creating connections between French Canadians and English Canadians even went so far as to influence the Debate Club to use French whenever possible in their exchanges, thereby normalizing French language debates and tours in Québec.

In light of the Leathes Report (1918), the UK's Education Act (1918) and the recommendations of the Imperial Education Conference on bilingual education (1923), Dean Kerr, formerly of Ontario and known to follow British educational policy development, would have been a model spokesman for French-English bilingualism among the English speaking majority. In addition, on account of the University of Alberta's connection to England via Dr. Tory's involvement with another British social reform initiative, Khaki University, the local campus would have been a natural extension for progressive reforms from England that would promote the liberal ideals of equality between citizens and diversity of life styles. The French Club in particular exemplified a liberal view of equality of citizens, including equality of majority and minority members as well as the equality of the English and French languages. The emphasis on the variety of French language social activities and keynote addresses take on a greater meaning when viewed as examples of liberal equality and diversity.

The Diversity Argument and National Minorities in a Liberal State

The Leathes Report (1918) had argued that for modern languages to be taken seriously in schools, they first had to be taken seriously by universities. In Alberta, all the promotion of French language courses and opportunities on campus created a useful objective for French language achievement in Alberta's public schools. Students with designs to attend the University of Alberta during the 1920s would have been aware of the opportunities to use their French language skills in authentic interactions with French speakers and the prospective university awards in French language study. In addition to university information for prospective students, the French Club meeting announcements in *The Edmonton Journal* appeared regularly. The opportunities for practical application of university and grade school French courses would have likely made French language learning more appealing to students and their parents as well. As such, the University of Alberta played an important role in providing the majority with the option of cultural diversity.

For all the importance accorded to the French language at the University of Alberta and by extension, the recognition afforded to the local French Canadian community, Dr. Kerr was not a member of the Legislature and so he and his colleagues could not directly influence provincial government. While they did their work on campus, their allies in the Legislature strove to promote the recognition of the French language in government and in education.

Among the MLAs who were French language advocates, the Hon. C. L. Gibbs is particularly illustrative of Kymlicka's argument of majority self-interest. Like Dr. Kerr, the Hon. Gibbs was a worldly Anglophone. Hailing directly from the UK, Mr. Gibbs had

arrived in Alberta with a British education and a passion for the French language. An architect, a technical school instructor and a Labor party politician, Mr. Gibbs was also well versed in English social reforms and was supportive of housing initiatives for the working class, such as what had been introduced in England (*The Gateway*, January 23 1923, p. 4; Powell, 2013, p. 3). Much like the Englishman Hon. Mitchell of the Territorial Assembly during the 1880s and 1890s (cf. Aunger, 1998), the Hon. C. L. Gibbs defended the rights of the French-speaking minority and upheld the liberal values of equality and diversity within the liberal state. Formerly from the UK, both these men had a special status among the local Anglophone majority and that increased their political importance and influence.

The Problem and the Potential with the use of the Majority's Self-interest to Promote Diversity within the Liberal State

Kymlicka (1995/2000) perceived the argument of majority self-interest, although a popular promotion of diversity, as a weak promotion of justice because it was focused primarily on “how the larger society also benefits from group-differentiated rights” (p. 121). While that may be true, the majority's self-interest can nevertheless assist the equality argument and promote societal change that recognizes national minority rights while remaining consistent with the liberal tradition that agrees with external protections for differentiated group rights without any internal restrictions (see Kymlicka, 1995/2000, Ch. 3). By supporting the minority, by sharing in what makes them different beyond festivals, such as learning their language, the majority's self-interest can be a useful and powerful motivation for equality. Moreover, by taking an interest in the minority

language, the majority demonstrates that it accepts that language as valuable and possibly equal to its own.

In 1925, Alberta's French-English bilingual education was not even designated to include English-speaking students. Yet, a decade later, there was evidence that there were indeed students with English as their first language in the French language program (Gibault, 1939). It must be recalled that the Leathes Report (1918) had strongly advocated in favour of modern language education partly on account of the individual and societal benefits that strong second language skills in a living language could accrue in areas such as business and the civil service. Whereas in the UK, French was a foreign language, in Canada, French was the language of a national minority. If English-speaking Canadians were investing in French language acquisition, it may have been for practical reasons as discussed in the Leathes Report (1918) and the Imperial Education Conferences (1923, 1927). Alternatively, it may have been for benefit of socio-political harmony, as encouraged by Dr Viljoen in 1911 and 1923. Whether it be for increased business opportunities, increased (teaching) employment opportunities, and/or for better relations among the majority and the minority language speakers of the country, bilingualism could be beneficial for all. As such, within Alberta, the majority's self-interest in French language education could have supported language education claims of the national French Canadian minority.

French Immersion programs that were established in Alberta as of the 1970s also joined the interests of a majority who supported the interests of the minority's linguistic claims for French-English bilingual education. It was through those first French Immersion programs that many French Canadians in Alberta, along with a large number

of English-speaking Canadians and immigrant residents, went to school in French up to 80% of the day, every day. Today, Francophone education and French Immersion education in Alberta, while distinct from each other in order to better fulfill the different linguistic needs of Francophone and non-Francophone students, remain rooted together in the same claim for French-English bilingual education that stems from a respect of the national minority's linguistic rights. The formal acceptance by the majority of a national minority's language rights in education within a liberal state had been demonstrated by the Imperial Education Conference's recommendations for bilingual education in 1923. as well as two years later by the provincial government's issuance of the *Instructions* that extended the French program in Alberta.

Conclusion

In the 1920s, the British Empire was metamorphosing into a Commonwealth of Nations. This transformation reflected a growing appreciation for national minorities in British liberal tradition throughout the British Empire/Commonwealth. As such, social reforms reflective of consideration for groups and minorities within a liberal framework came to characterize the decade in England and throughout her sphere of influence, including Alberta.

The recognition of national minorities' bilingual education claims at the Imperial Education Conferences were formalized in London in 1923 and extended in discussion in 1927. The formal recognition took the shape of guidelines to help different states of the Commonwealth deal with their particular homeland situations. In Alberta, there had been a longtime struggle by the national French Canadian minority for French-English bilingual education. The national minority claim had been argued on historic grounds that

promoted the equality of French speaking and English speaking Canadians, but without much success until 1925. By the end of WWI, the local French Canadian effort had been joined by influential members of the English speaking majority. After much promotion of the French language at the University of Alberta and attempts within the Legislature, in harmony with the social reforms called for in England by the Leathes Report (1918), the Education Act (1918) and the Imperial Education Conference recommendations on bilingual education in 1923, bilingual education in Alberta was recognized in 1925. While limited in scope, the Alberta Department of Education's *Instructions* concerning the new French language program in publicly funded schools demonstrated a degree of liberal thinking akin to the progressive views on national minority rights that had been promoted in England. The new program established in 1925 by the Alberta government can be understood as a provincial expression of dominant British liberal ideals, in light of Will Kymlicka's arguments for national minority rights based on equality, history, and diversity, all within the liberal framework.

Chapter 13: Project Considerations, Implications and Recommendations

In Canada, French-English bilingual education has been subject to much opposition over the years. In Alberta, the struggle to re-establish French-English bilingual education dates back to the late 19th century. In the 1920s, after a series of Imperial Education Conferences in London, England, that coincided with renewed recognition of national minority rights, bilingual education started to be seen in a favorable light. The change in the British imperial attitude was also apparent in the Canadian provincial experience with bilingual education during the same decade. In Alberta, the Department of Education's *Instructions for the Teaching of French in the province of Alberta* (1925) marked a new chapter in French-English bilingual education.

Considerations

In the mid 19th century, the French language was a recognized language of government and a medium of instruction in schools of the Northwest Territories. When English-speaking settlers from Ontario moved out West, they brought with them their conception of the public school and the nation-state. For Anglo-Canadian settlers, these ideals became all the more important to uphold in the Northwest Territories given the established presence of French Canadians and the increasingly heterogeneous population that was a result of immigration policies to develop the Prairies. The government's vision for the nascent prairie society was characterized by a unilingual policy for public administration and education. The public school was essential to the linguistic and cultural assimilation of the multicultural immigrant population and the French Canadian element in society as well. That vision clashed with the established bilingual nature of

government administration and education, and created conflict with the French Canadian community.

By the end of the 19th century, when the French Canadian population had become outnumbered and a minority, leaders of the powerful English-speaking majority sought to sanction English as the official language of government and schools. In the early 1890s, despite the opposition of fellow councilors such as the Hon. Hillyard Mitchell from England, the Hon. Frederick Haultain set about ridding the Northwest Territories of its official bilingualism, contrary to the Northwest Territories Act (1877). By 1892, the federal government had accorded the Territorial Assembly more power, and the Haultain government effectively proclaimed English as the only language of government and education.

French-English bilingual education in Alberta should have been eradicated in 1892, but it managed to survive. This survival was in part largely due to the tenacity of the French speaking community and the integral support of the French speaking Catholic nuns and clergy; but also on account of the prevailing liberal ideals in England and Wales concerning minority rights and like-minded liberals of the local majority. By 1896, French-English bilingual education had received a reprieve of sorts when the territorial government changed tactics and decided instead to use a semblance of bilingual education to achieve assimilation. This transitional bilingual education allowed French to be used at first, while the student also learned English. This not only promoted attendance at the state operated public schools, but allowed the education to shift entirely in English within a few years. In 1901, French was reduced to the same status as that of a foreign

language to further advance the majority's goal of assimilation and English language domination in order to create a British-like nation-state.

Despite these setbacks, advocates of true French-English bilingual schooling held fast in Alberta while liberal minority language rights were discussed at two successive Imperial Education Conferences. Following WWI, the establishment of the League of Nations, and the movement for dominion autonomy at the Imperial Conferences, group differentiated rights became mainstream concerns in British liberal thought. News of the social reforms that characterized the post-war political agenda in England and Wales became known in Alberta, via media coverage and public addresses by faculty members of the University of Alberta. Under the leadership of Dean Kerr, the University became a hub promoting the French language and encouraging bilingualism via authentic social interactions between the English speaking majority and the French speaking national minority.

Flanked by support from some influential majority members such as the university president's right hand man, Dean Kerr, and English architect turned politician, C.L. Gibbs, the minority's leaders kept up their efforts to obtain better French-English bilingual education in Alberta. In 1923, the Imperial Education Conference formulated and recommended a number of guidelines in promotion of national minority language rights via bilingual education. In Alberta, the provincial government accepted the French-Canadian minority leaders' invitation to review the interpretation of the provincial educational language policy. In 1925, without any fuss, the Department of Education of the province of Alberta established a new program for French language education. Designed for Francophone students, it extended the study of French until the eighth grade

inclusively, did away with extra fees, and permitted explanations in French whenever necessary. However, not only would there be but one daily hour of French study allowed as of the third grade, this permission further depended on the cooperation of the teacher and the entire school's population, Francophone and non-Francophone alike.

Despite its limitations, the *Instructions for the Teaching of French in the province of Alberta (1925)* marked a return of bilingual education in the region, sanctioned by the government. Throughout the 1920s, French Canadian minority rights were promoted in the Legislature by bilingual MLAs and especially, on campus by Dean Kerr and professors of the Modern Languages Department by means of the French Club, the French Play and the Debate Society. Even *The Gateway* supported these efforts. This era of recognition and cooperation between members of the English speaking majority and the members of the French Canadian minority reflected the pervasiveness of the British liberal discourse that accommodated minority rights, especially in matters of language and education. The Imperial Education Conference recommendations on bilingual education in 1923 were a concrete expression of this accommodative liberal discourse. Furthermore, the conference recommendations were an invitation to all member states of the emerging Commonwealth to consider bilingual education as a means to better integrate, rather than assimilate, local minorities into the nation-building effort.

Implications

British liberalism promoting group-differentiated rights in between the two World Wars has had a lasting effect on Alberta's educational policies. Such mainstream thinking emanating from England created a legitimate alternative nation-building option to the traditional unilingual nation-state vision that had dominated the formative years of

the province. Given Alberta's multiple ties to England, first through the early Imperial Conferences attended by the Hon. A. C. Rutherford, then by the continued association of the University of Alberta with Khaki University at the end of the war, and also by the promotional efforts of provincial and British interests through the means of Alberta's Agent-General office in London, the province was particularly attentive to British views. The renewed importance of minority group rights in British liberalism by the end of the First World War as expressed in parliamentary commission reports and legislation in the UK was also to be found in the Imperial Education Conference recommendations for bilingual education in 1923. These manifestations of recognition of minority group rights within a liberal state may be explained by Kymlicka's (1995) argumentation in favour of minority group rights according to equality, history and diversity. This implies that many examples of late 20th century legislation concerning minority groups such as official bilingualism in Canada, was not new but latent formalization of ideas that had been discussed repeatedly throughout the 20th century.

Regardless of the lack of provincial government documentation about these conferences, and the little attention they received in local newspapers, the Imperial Education Conferences were crucial for Alberta's French language education policies because they represented an opportunity for change. These recommendations were a concrete signal of the emphasis on accommodation within imperial liberal thought and provided likeminded people in the province at all levels of society the opportunity to further this liberal ideal, and justify more formal French language education. While the *Instructions* of 1925 were limited in scope, they nonetheless authorized a return of

French-English bilingual education in the province and the chance for bilingual education to grow.

Despite strong opposition to bilingualism by many Anglo-Canadian Imperialists, throughout the province and across the country, who valued the teachings of Professor Freeman and Professor Laurie, the provincial government allowed just enough French language education that afforded determined leaders of 'la survivance' to organize and keep the embers of the French language from burning out in this province. The Imperial Education Conferences, the provincial allowances for French language education in the province, and the stalwart efforts of Dean Kerr and his allies to locally promote the French language, to develop an appreciation of French Canadian culture and to encourage a rapprochement between Anglo-Canadians and their French-speaking neighbors were manifestations of British liberalism in progress. As the Anglo-Imperial societal structure grappled with the issue of minority rights, liberalism was forged anew to better cope with socio-political questions pertaining to what Kymlicka (1995/2000) referred to as the multination state.

The research in French language education in western Canada has typically focused on the efforts of the French Canadian communities alone. However, this project has demonstrated how the French Canadian community in Alberta, as well as the province as a whole benefitted from a movement in the British Empire to recognize the value of national minorities and bilingual education during approximately the first quarter of the 20th century and reaching a first apogee in the 1920s. This was the period that prepared the way for the future of French-English bilingual programs in Alberta. The 1923 Imperial Education Conference recommendations set a precedent for bilingual

education throughout the Commonwealth. Typically, French Immersion in Alberta is recognized as having officially debuted in the 1970s, followed by Francophone education in the 1980s et 1990s. These programmes are usually presented as the result of decades of effort by the French language community to make the French language survive in this province. Forgotten factors that also had a role in the story of ‘la survivance’ were the local members of the English speaking community, such as Dean Kerr, and the wave of British liberalism during the 1920s that shaped British parliamentary reports as well as imperial education conference discussions and recommendations concerning bilingual education. These elements would have been essential to the continued presence of the French language as a living language in the early years of the province and foundational to the establishment of French immersion and Francophone education half a century later.

Moreover, given the continued discussions about bilingual education at the Imperial Education Conferences, and the attention reserved for the Welsh and especially the South African experiences, it is interesting to note that some ideas, such as social harmony, were taken up in the Canadian context in later years. In the 1960s, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism suggested that official bilingualism would benefit social unity across the country. The federal government of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau established institutional bilingualism that, while it did not impose personal bilingualism among the greater population, provided great incentives for personal bilingualism among the federal civil service, thereby respecting the essence of choice within a liberal society. Since /then, the demand for French Immersion programmes has remained significant.

The present day demand for French Immersion education presents both a problem and an opportunity. While the federal government of Canada still provides funds for official minority language education to the provinces, this money has not matched the demand over the years as the liberal state of the 1960s has adopted a more neoliberal outlook in the ensuing decades. In the 1980s and throughout the 1990s, as the shift towards neoliberalism was gaining momentum in the province of Alberta, the provincial budgetary cutbacks in education left French language education increasingly dependent on federal government funding. This expectation of greater federal government support in education has been paradoxical in an era of increased neoliberalism predicated on less government involvement and greater expectation of market forces to sustain individual choice and meet the needs of a student body perceived as a clientele.

As mentioned in Apple (2014), the changes in government participation in education has included higher education. Apple (2014) addressed primarily the different pressures in post-secondary teaching, and how these pressures affect the education of students. A longstanding stumbling block in bilingual education has been a lack of sufficient teachers. In the Canadian context, FI and Francophone education programs have suffered on account of the lack of qualified teachers.

As recently as March 1st, 2018, this point was discussed at length at a meeting in Edmonton, Alberta, of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Official Languages with various representatives of French language education in this province (Official Languages Committee, 2018). The participants from Alberta expressed a desire to see the Official Languages Act be modified to include greater protection for French second language programs, including all related funding, in order to offset their

vulnerability to the agendas of what Kymlicka (1995/2000, p. 112) had termed “political subunits” that make decisions about the availability and the accessibility to French language education. At this meeting, it had been argued that the underfunding of the University of Alberta’s Campus Saint-Jean (CSJ) hinders its efforts in the impossible task to supply enough bilingual teachers to meet the demand in Alberta, let alone western Canada. This situation in turn contributes to restrict the availability of French language education and that ultimately affects the number of western Canadian qualified candidates for bilingual teacher education at CSJ. Accordingly, these circumstances entail other challenges such as the recruitment of bilingual candidates elsewhere and the difficulties that follow. A conservative member of the Standing Committee responded with an expression of appreciation for the dire situation, and assured the participants that their comments would be passed along. However, the conservative member avoided any commitment by the federal government for additional support, citing that education was, after all, a provincial jurisdiction.

The exchange at the Edmonton meeting of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Official Languages exemplified that bilingual French-English education in Alberta faces many of the same challenges in 2018 as in the 1920s: lack of qualified teachers, lack of funding, and lack of sufficient government support. However, in a new century characterized by rapid capitalist globalization, bilingual education may become advocated by the neoliberal standpoint.

In world where the global and the local are closely intertwined in real time, it could be practical to speak two global languages that have a local flavor. French and English are old colonial languages but they have developed differently here. The

promotion of Canadian accents and expressions in these languages reveal Canadian perspectives and attitudes. This aspect also plays into the postcolonial discourse of empowering formerly subjugated cultural groups, both at home and on the world stage. As such, bilingual education in Alberta could be perceived as providing an added value for students to become familiar with both official language groups and the opportunity to use that knowledge in their interactions with others. This recalls Hoogvelt's (2001, p. 170) understanding of the value of hybridity in postcolonial discourse as a means of a "transformative engagement with modernity" as opposed to "being eliminated by modernity". This hybrid state, what I will refer to as a form of *métissage*, that was once disparaged, has now become an advantage. In the neoliberal context, this advantage could be key to economic prosperity.

In an era when education has become increasingly shaped by school choice and the interests of the workplace, "educational neoliberal reforms are based on an economic model of policy" according to Torres (2009, p. 43). This said, my understanding of Kymlicka's (1995/2000) and Manzer's (1994) combined interpretations of liberal traditions in the 20th century demonstrate that each liberal era should not be understood in absolute terms but in competing terms, when traces of different right or left wing thinking remain while other ideas dominate. In the 1920s with the province's Instructions in French language education or in the 1960s with the national Official Languages Act, government liberal reform policy didn't impose both languages but respected people's freedom and created conditions for people to choose an education in one or both of Canada's official languages. Freedom and choice in language education was also characteristic of the South African experience with right-based bilingual education, for

both first and second language speakers. Moreover, bilingualism was deemed an asset in teacher education both in South Africa and in the 1923 recommendations in bilingual education in order to better fulfill the required posting, wherever it may be. Bilingualism was also deemed good for diplomatic and entrepreneurial reasons in the Leathes Report (1918). As such, then as now, in addition to the promotion of social harmony, bilingual education for members of the majority could increase their clout and economic prospects, and by extension, that of their province and country.

In a neoliberal society, bilingual education may become associated with economic wealth and so the refusal to recognize right-based bilingual education in Canada and in Alberta might encourage further privatization of education and increase competition between public schools and private schools. As it stands today, in the wake of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Official Languages meeting in Edmonton, French as a second official language (FSOL) education remains unguaranteed and parents in the public education system are subject to the changing will of the educational authorities. Without any legislative provisions to ensure the funding and the allocation of resources to both the Kindergarten to Grade 12 education system in Alberta, and the Campus Saint-Jean of the University of Alberta, the demand might provoke a breach of public monopoly on French Immersion education by turning to the private sector. This breach has already occurred in the elementary and secondary education sectors by the presence of private schooling options, such as the Calgary French and International School and the Lycée Louis Pasteur, also in Calgary. For decades, these two private schools have promised an education that has promoted functional bilingualism in French and English, and they have invited applications by all, regardless of creed, cultural or linguistic

background of prospective students. While tuition fees and the school authority to accept or thank applicants may restrict the access to this bilingual education format, the longevity of these two schooling options amidst an array of bilingual public education choices indicate that programs such as FI can thrive in the private sector.

Apple (2014) has argued that neoliberalism's allure rests on its common sense alternative to the deficiencies in the public system of education. Therefore, the onus is on public education officials and their colleagues at all levels of government to find ways to become more responsive to concerns, such as the demand for availability of and access to bilingual FSOL education. In the 1920s, the provincial UFA government quietly espoused limited bilingual education within its rural educational liberal reforms. What lies ahead for the current provincial government?

The response to the insufficiencies linked to the availability of French Immersion bilingual education everywhere in the country provides an opportunity to wonder. Would the lack of availability be the same if French Immersion were recognized as a right-based education? Kymlicka (1995/2000) believed in the importance for national minorities to partake in the democratic process, in their own language. Apple (2014, p. 18) described person rights as the ability to engage in society at many levels, including the political and institutional decision-making process and "reciprocity in relations of power and authority". Apple (2014, p. p. xxii) spoke of the need to combat thin democratic actions of neoliberals with "truly responsive and thick democratic public sphere". Thick democracy is less about choice and more about the opportunities and conditions favorable to fuller participation (Apple, 2014, p. 171). As such, in this age of neoliberal globalization, could thicker democratic participation in Canada include the option for

everyone to engage in the polity in the official language of their choice, regardless of their first language?

Echoes of the old Imperial Education Conference presentations are discernible in current discussions. In 1911, bilingual education in Wales was not deemed to be a problem, but rather an advantage. In 1923, Dr. Viljoen of South Africa explained how bilingual education in both official languages was a parent's right. This contrasts the Albertan experience where, almost a century later, French Immersion bilingual education is often perceived as problematic and remains an alternative form of education, as opposed to a right as is English language education for all Albertans. Moreover, as fees were incurred for access to French language education in this province at the turn of the 20th century, so are fees incurred today when choosing French Immersion in places such as Calgary and Edmonton (Ferguson, *The Calgary Herald*, September 8 2017, n.p.; French, *The Edmonton Journal*, September 22 2017, n.p.). Though the fees in 2017 are tied to travel costs and not teaching, the result is the same; limited access to French-English bilingual education. Given the progress of French-English bilingual education in the province in the far reaching shadow of the Imperial Education Conference of 1923, the claim for right-based bilingual education for all Albertans, all Canadians, seems well rooted in experience and a plausible step in the development of French Immersion education in this province

While neoliberal discourse may come to promote bilingual education for its economic benefits, it isn't clear how that might affect bilingual education as a nation-building enterprise, as a way to encourage the French speaking minority to espouse a deeper sense of shared membership as defined by Kymlicka (1995/2000). Without the

emphasis on social harmony, could FSOL education such as FI be skewed in a neoliberal context in way that could discourage a sense of shared membership among the members of the national French speaking minority? As Kymlicka (1995/2000) has cautioned against the fallacy of equating national minority gains based on numbers with gains based on recognition of the national minority's nature, so might we exercise caution here. In the 1920s, the French speaking national minority in Alberta gained a largely symbolic victory of French language education, as their numbers were too few in many places to benefit in practice from the increased French language education. Almost a century later, if FSOL were to become recognized as a right-based education, regardless of one's first language, care would be required in order to establish whether this recognition would primarily further enable the national minority's sense of shared membership or primarily further facilitate diplomatic and economic trade ventures. Within a neoliberal context, it is unclear what the latter possibility might mean for the national minority's sense of shared membership and future nation-building efforts via bilingual education.

Recommendations

This socio-political view of French-English bilingual education in Alberta within the British Empire in transition, with a focus during the 1920s, has provided new information about this province's educational policy history and the discourse surrounding 'la survivance'. It has also demonstrated the value in taking the long view when doing a case study and provided insight to a multitude of seemingly unrelated bits of information that have come together to shape our understanding of the historical context. While there are many aspects of the story of French-English bilingual education

that are shared or linked across Ontario and the Prairie Provinces, other aspects are specific to Alberta. It is the combination of the commonality of conditions with the particular context of this province's aspirations, people, and their strategies that have allowed a certain development of French-English education. These combinations have also affected the interpretation presented within these pages. The socio-political analysis developed here started as broad strokes that have been refined page by page in order to come to a better understanding of the Alberta experience with regards to bilingual French-English education at a time that was foundational to the future establishment of French Immersion programs as well as Francophone education in this province.

The findings presented here ought to be understood as a work in progress to better accommodate national minority language rights within a liberal state. These insights into the longstanding tradition of bilingual education in this region should serve to inform current and future educational policy in this province, especially in terms of bilingual French-English education. It is hoped that this work will promote greater care when decisions are made about national minority language rights that ultimately shape the kind of diversity that will be nurtured in this province. Not only are minority language rights important to the national minority, they may be important to the majority as well. If a country has two official languages, it is not unheard of that all citizens have the right to a bilingual education, such as was the case in South Africa in the first quarter of the 20th century. As education is a provincial jurisdiction in Canada, this question should be seriously considered in Alberta. Given the interest in bilingual education by both the minority and the majority, as demonstrated by the experiences in Wales and South Africa between 1905 and 1923, as well in Alberta throughout its history, it would be important

to not only remain aware of these experiences but to learn of the experiences of other countries with bilingual education in order to better adjust the bilingual education framework in this province to everyone's advantage.

The insights of this research need to be shared, not only with policymakers but with teachers as well. In particular, the history of bilingual French-English education in Alberta in light of the FCE (1911), the IEC (1911), the IEC (1927) and especially the IEC (1923) should be part of the Foundations of Education courses both on Campus St-Jean as well as on the North Campus, within the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta. This knowledge would be instrumental in shaping teachers' understanding of the current French-English bilingual education programs in Alberta and their underlying histories. This understanding could lead to greater accommodation in their teaching and more nuanced decisions once in school administrative roles.

Given the unique way French-English bilingual education was promoted in this province during the 1920s, more research into the following decades would allow greater understanding of what preceded the development of French Immersion programs and Francophone schools within this province. For example, what was the significance of a seemingly unchanged version of *The Instructions for the teaching of the French language* issued by the provincial government in 1936? What were the circumstances surrounding the addition of grade nine to the French language program during the 1940s? After decades of asserting a French language program only for Francophone students, what changed prior to the provincial government's amalgamation of bilingual education for French and English speakers when French Immersion was introduced in Alberta? What were the implications of this modification for French-English bilingual education in

Alberta? These are but a few outstanding questions that could shed light on the reasoning behind the provincial government's French-English bilingual education policies over the years. It is my sincere hope that this project will help promote more historical research and understanding of the evolution of the French-English bilingual education question in Alberta and the greater contexts in which this provincial issue has developed.

Conclusion

The traditional discourse of the 'la survivance' in Alberta is one of diligent work to preserve the French language as a living language in this province. Contrary to popular thought, English speakers' interest in bilingual French-English education did not suddenly spark in the 1960s and 1970s. Rather, this interest was present in the efforts to promote bilingual education throughout the 20th century, especially in the 1920s.

Benefitting from the growing attention to national minorities in mainstream liberal British thinking by the end of the First World War, bilingual education became increasingly popular within the sphere of British influence. With Wales and South Africa leading the way, bilingual education was found to encourage socio-political unity through the means of authentic membership, without impediment of individual academic progress. The support bilingual education had garnered in earlier conference discussions led to the formal principles of bilingual education in 1923 and continued discussions at the ensuing Imperial Education Conference in 1927. Following the Leathes Report (1918) and the Education Act (1918) in the midst of the series of Imperial Education Conferences and at the end of WWI, it was clear that England was engaged in educational renewal, and that bilingual education was not to be dismissed. As Alberta

seemed to nurture close ties with London and followed many of the educational changes promoted in England, bilingual education was not easily dismissed in the province either.

While the provincial French Canadian population continued its efforts to include more French in grade school education, Dean Kerr of the University of Alberta, created opportunities to bring the French and English speaking communities closer together and promoted the use of French within the university space. Both locally and overseas then, bilingual education had strong support. If the Imperial Education Conferences did not have rule of law, they certainly provided clear practical ideas about bilingual education for governments of the Commonwealth. By 1925, the Alberta government had formalized a French language course for Francophones that extended until the eighth grade inclusively. Though limited in scope and depth, this new course marked a return of sanctioned bilingual French-English education in the province and provided evidence of Alberta's acknowledgement of the Imperial Education Conference recommendations of 1923. The new primary French course was a significant milestone that prepared the way for French Immersion and Francophone education to blossom in the province fifty and sixty years later.

References

- Abu-Laman, Y. (2007). History, power, and contradictions in a liberal state: A response to Will Kymlicka. In K. Banting, T. J. Courchene, & F. L. Seidle (Eds.), *The art of the State, volume III: Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada* (pp. 95-104). Montreal, Canada: Institute for research on public policy (IRPP).
- Apple, M. W. (2014). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (3rd ed.). NY: Routledge.
- Archibald, J., Roy, S., Harmel, S., & Jesney, K. (2004). *A review of the literature on second language learning*. Edmonton: Alberta Learning.
- Arsenian, S. (1937/1972). *Bilingualism and mental development*. New York, NY: AMS Press. (Reprinted from *Contribution to education: Teachers' college series, no. 172*, 1937, New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University).
- Aunger, E. A. (1989a). Language and law in the province of Alberta. In P. Pupier & J. Woehrling (Eds.), *Language and law: Proceedings of the first conference of the international institute of comparative linguistic law* (pp. 203-225). Montreal: Wilson and Lafleur Ltd.
- Aunger, E. A. (1989b). Langue et pouvoir: contexte politique de l'enseignement des études françaises. [Language and power: political context of teaching French studies.]. In G. Morcos (Ed.), *Bilinguisme et enseignement du français* (pp. 11-35). Montréal: Éditions du Méridien.
- Aunger, E. A. (1996). Dispersed minorities and segmental autonomy: French-language school boards in Canada. *Nationalism and ethnic politics*, 2(2), 191-215. doi: 10.1080/13537119608428467.
- Aunger, E. A. (1998). The mystery of the French language ordinances: An investigation into official bilingualism and the Canadian North-West (1870 to 1895). *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 13(1), 89-124. Retrieved from: <http://www.heinonline.org>.
- Aunger, E. A. (2001). Justifying the end of official bilingualism: Canada's North-West assembly and the dual-language question, 1889-1892. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 34(3), 451-486. Retrieved from: <http://jstor.org/stable/3233000>
- Aunger, E. A. (2002). Obsèques prématurées: La disparition des minorités francophones et autres illusions nationalistes. [Premature funeral: The disappearance of Francophone minorities and other nationalist illusions.]. *Review of Constitutional Studies*, 7(2), 120-142. Retrieved from: <http://www.ualberta.ca/eaunger/pubs/Obseques2002.pdf>
- Aunger, E. A. (2004a). Legislating language in Alberta: A century of incidental provisions for a fundamental matter. *Alberta Law Review*, 42(2), 463-497. Retrieved April 7th, 2013 from: <http://www.heinonline.org>.

- Aunger, E. A. (2004b). De la répression à la tolérance: les contrariétés du néolibéralisme linguistique en Alberta. [From repression to tolerance: the annoyances of linguistic neoliberalism in Alberta.]. In J.-P. Wallot (Ed.), *La gouvernance linguistique: Le Canada en perspective* (pp. 111-126). Ottawa: Les presses de l'Université d'Ottawa. Retrieved from: <http://www.site.ebrary.com>.
- Aunger, E. A. (2008). Espérance de vie: diagnostics et pronostics concernant l'avenir des communautés francophones d'Amérique. [Life expectancy: diagnostics and prognostics regarding the future of Francophone communities of North-America] *Francophonies d'Amérique*, 1(26), 249-273. Retrieved from: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/037984ar>
- Axelrod, H. C. (1951/1978). *Bilingualism background and its relation to certain aspects of character and personality of elementary school children*. New York: Arno Press. (Original work presented as the author's thesis, Yeshiva University, 1951).
- Bain, B. (1985). Assimilation and minority education. In A. Martel (Ed.), *Constitutional rights for minorities and a changing education structure in Alberta: Proceedings of the minority language education rights and the Constitution conference* (pp. 8-14). Edmonton: Publication Services, University of Alberta.
- Baker, C., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2001). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Toronto, Ontario: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baker, D. (1913, July 23). Letter to Mr. J.A. Reid regarding his appointment to the position of Agent-General of the province of Alberta. Accession No. M-314-22, Scrapbook No. 1, p. 28. Jessie DeGear Fonds, Glenbow Museum Archives.
- Bayley, S. (1991). Modern languages: An 'ideal of human learning': The Leathes Report of 1918. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 23(2), 11-24. Retrieved at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0022062910230202>
- Barik, H. and Swain, M. (1976). A Canadian experiment in bilingual education: The Peel study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 9(5), 465-479. Retrieved from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1976.tb02673.x/pdf>
- Barik, H. C., Swain, M. & Nwanunobi, E. A. (1997). English-French bilingual education: The Elgin study through grade five. *The Canadian modern language review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 33(4), 459-475.
- Berger, C. (1970/2013). *The sense of power: Studies in the ideas of Canadian imperialism, 1867-1914*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Betcherman, L. R. (2002). *Ernest Lapointe: Mackenzie King's great Quebec lieutenant*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Bibeau, G. (1991). L'immersion... de la coupe aux lèvres [Immersion... from the cup to the lips]. *Études de linguistique appliquée*, 82(1), 127-138. Retrieved from: <http://media.proquest.com>
- Biesta, G. & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), 63-79. Retrieved from:

- <http://www.tandfonline.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/doi/pdf/10.1080/03057640500490981>
- Bilash, O. (1998). Planning for writing instruction in a middle years immersion/partial immersion setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31(2), 159-168. Retrieved from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/doi/10.1111/fla.1998.31.issue-2/issuetoc>
- Bloor McLaren, G. (1992). Guide to the papers of the Rutherford and McCuaig families 1885-1982. Accession No. 86-41. Book and Records Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Blue, J. (1924). *Alberta past and present, historical and biographical* (vol. 3). Chicago, Illinois: Pioneer Historical Publishing Co.
- Board of Education and Scotch Education Department. (1907, May 24). Letter to A.C. Rutherford. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-5a, Box 1. Department of Education 1906-1913, Book and Records Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Bogden, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). Research design. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Boston, USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bonan, M. (2004). Declining French immersion enrolment trends in Canada and its impact on École Letellier School. In S.B. Straw (Ed.), *Schools today: Promoting educational success. Education graduate student symposium* (pp. 73-86). Winnipeg, Manitoba: Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.
- Retrieved from:
http://www.umanitoba.ca/ca/faculties/education/symposium05inside.shtml/chapter_5_Maria_Bonan.pdf
- Bournot-Trites, M., & Reeder, K. (2001). Interdependence revisited: Mathematics achievement in an intensified French immersion program. *The Canadian modern language review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 58(1), 27-43.
- Bournot-Trites, M., & Tallowitz, U. (2002). *Report of current research on the effects of second language learning on first language skills* [A report commissioned by the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation]. Halifax: The Printing House.
- Brundage, A. (2008). *Going to the sources: A guide to historical research and writing* (4th ed.). Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson Inc.
- Burns, G. E., & Olson, C. P. (1983). Politics, class, and happenstance: French immersion in a Canadian context. *Interchange*, 14(1), 1-16. Retrieved from: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01805814#>
- Burns, G. E., & Olson, C. P. (1989). Planning and professionalizing immersion and other FSL programs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 45(3), 502-515.
- Cadez, R. V. (2006). *Student attrition in specialized high school programs: An examination of three French immersion centres* (Unpublished master's thesis).

- University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Canada. Retrieved from:
<http://www.uleth.ca/education/sites/education/files/RonCadesThesis.pdf>
- Cairns, A. C., & C. Williams (1985). Constitutionalism, citizenship and society in Canada: An overview. In A. Cairns & C. Williams (Eds.), *Constitutionalism, citizenship and society in Canada* (pp. 1-50). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Carey, S.T. (1989). Pour ou contre le bilinguisme [For or against bilingualism]. In G. Morcos (Ed.), *Bilinguisme et enseignement du français* (pp. 61-78). Montréal, Québec: Éditions du Méridien.
- Carlyle, W. (1987). The changing geography of administrative units for rural schooling and local government on the Canadian prairies. *Prairie Forum*. 12(1), 5-35.
- Carr, W. (2013). Learning French in British Columbia: English as an additional language learner and parent perspectives. In K. Arnett, & C. Mady (Eds.), *Minority populations in Canadian second language education* (pp. 22-37). Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Central advisory council for Education (Wales). (1953). *The place of Welsh and English in the schools of Wales*. London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Clément, R., Smythe, C., & Gardner, R. C. (1978). Persistence in second-language study: Motivational considerations. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 34(4), 689-694.
- Cohen, A. D., & Swain, M. (1976). Bilingual education: The 'Immersion' model in the North American context. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 45-53. Retrieved from:
<http://www.jstor.org/stable3585938>
- Constantine, S. (1991). *Lloyd George*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from: <https://www-taylorfrancis-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/books/9781134963591>
- Cook, R. (1963). *The politics of John. W. Dafoe and the Free Press*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cook, R. & Macrae, D. B. (1965). A Canadian account of the 1926 imperial conference. *Commonwealth comparative politics*, 3(1), 50-63. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14662046508447011>
- Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., & Randall, E.V. (2004). *Better policies, better schools*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Couture, C. (2001). La disparition inévitable des francophones à l'extérieur du Québec: un fait inéluctable ou le reflet d'un discours déterministe? [The inevitable disappearance of Francophones outside Quebec: an inescapable fact or the reflection of a deterministic discourse?]. *Francophonies d'Amérique*, 1(11), 7-18. Retrieved from: <http://www.id.erudit.org/iderudit/1005103ar>
- CPF Alberta (2012, Fall). No rights or guarantees for French immersion. *CPF Alberta News*. No. 109, pp. 1-2. Calgary, Alberta: Author.

- Culligan, K. (2010). "Pente" or slope? Using student voices to explore program choice and experiences in secondary French immersion mathematics. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 66(3), 421-444. Retrieved from:
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db&AN=48400280&site=ehost-live-&scope=site>
- Curtis, B. (2012). *Ruling by schooling: Conquest to liberal governmentality: A historical sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Dagenais, D., Day, E., & Toohey, K. (2006). A multilingual child's literacy practices and contrasting identities in the Figured Worlds French immersion classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2), 205-218. Retrieved from:
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=21092678&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Dagenais, D., & Moore, D. (2008). Représentations des littératies plurilingues, de l'immersion en français et des dynamiques identitaires chez des parents chinois [Representations of multilingual literacies, French immersion and identity dynamics among Chinese parents]. *La revue canadienne des langues vivantes/ The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(1), 11-31. Retrieved from:
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=35042010&loginpage=Login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Darcy, N.T. (1946). The effect on bilingualism upon the measurement of the intelligence of children of preschool age. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, 37(1), 21-44. Retrieved from: <http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com>.
- Darsie, M. L. (1926). The mental capacity of American-born Japanese children. *Comparative Psychology Monographs*, 111(15), 1-89.
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (1996). *Studies in immersion education*. Clevedon Hall, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (2001). Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: An experimental study. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 51(1), 47-80.
- Denis, W. B. (2006). Francophone education in Saskatchewan: resisting anglo-hegemony. In B. Noonan, D. Hallman, & M. Scharf (Eds.), *A history of education in Saskatchewan: selected readings* (pp. 87-108). Regina, Saskatchewan: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1911). *Fifth annual report of the Department of Education of the province of Alberta 1910*. Edmonton, Canada: Jas. E. Richards, Government Printer.

- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1912). *Sixth annual report of the department of Education of the province of Alberta 1911*. Edmonton, Canada: Jas. E. Richards, Government Printer.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1914). *List of textbooks authorized by the Department of Education, Sessional paper no. 15*. Sessional papers of the Legislative assembly of the province of Alberta (1909-1960). Accession No. 70.414, Box No. 3, Item No. 83, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1917a). *Department of Education annual report 1916, Sessional paper no. 51*. Accession No. 1970.0414, Box No. 6, Item No. 211, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1917b). *Regulations of the Department of Education governing the public school leaving examination 1916*. Edmonton, Canada: J. W. Jeffery, Government Printer. [Included as Appendix B in Sessional Papers No. 51]. Accession No. 70.414, Item No. 148, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1917c). *Regulations of the Department of Education governing the courses of studies and annual examination for grades IX, X, XI and XII for the year ending June 30th 1916 and Teachers' Certificates 1916*. Edmonton, Canada: J. W. Jeffery, Government Printer. [Included as Appendix C in Sessional Papers No. 51]. Accession No. 70.414, Item No. 148, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1918). *Twelfth annual report of the Department of Education of the province of Alberta 1917*. Edmonton, Canada: J. W. Jeffery, King's Printer.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1919). *Thirteenth annual report of the Department of Education of the province of Alberta 1918*. Edmonton, Canada: J. W. Jeffery, King's Printer.
- Department of Education of the Province of Alberta (1920). *Fourteenth annual report of the Department of Education of the province of Alberta 1919*. Edmonton, Canada: J. W. Jeffery, King's Printer.
- Department of Education the Province of Alberta (1925). *Instructions concerning the teaching of French in the elementary schools of the province*. Edmonton, Canada: J. W. Jeffery, King's Printer. Accession No. ALTA 448 1925 Gr1-8, Item No. Elem 20, University of Alberta Curriculum Archives.
- Department of the Interior, B. (1919). *Education in parts of the British empire. Bulletin, 1919, No 49*. Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Department of the Provincial Secretary of the Province of Alberta (1928). *Report of the Department of the Provincial Secretary of the Province of Alberta 1927*. Accession No. 71.0276, Box 8, File No. 66, Provincial Archives of Alberta.

- Department of the Provincial Secretary of the Province of Alberta (1934[?]). *Report of the Provincial Secretary of the Province of Alberta 1933*, p. 12. Accession No. 71.0276, Box 8, File No. 66, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Dubé, S. (1993). *French immersion withdrawal: Parental perspectives* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Dunn, J. H. (1909a, July 3). Letter to A.C. Rutherford, accepting Agent-General nomination. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-1, Box 1, 2 pages. Department of Education 1906-1913, Book and Records Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Dunn, J. H. (1909b, September 8). Telegram to Premier Rutherford. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-1, Box 1, p. 1 of 1. Department of Education 1906-1913, Book and Record Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Edmonton Journal, The (n.d.). About Us: Historical Information. Retrieved from: <http://eee.edmontonjournal.com/about-edmonton-journal/history.html>
- Edwards, V. (1991). Études postsecondaires et immersion [Post-secondary studies and French immersion.]. *Études de linguistique appliquée*, 82(1), 116-126. Retrieved from: <http://media.proquest.com>.
- Engel de Abreu, P. M. J., Cruz-Santos, A., Tourinho, C. J., Martin, R., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Bilingualism enriches the poor: Enhanced cognitive control in low-income minority children. *Psychological Science*, 23(11), 1364-1371. Retrieved from: <http://pss.sagepub.com/content/23/11/1364>
- Executive Council of the Province of Alberta. (1913, July 23). Certified copy of the Order-In-Council naming J.A. Reid as Agent-General of the province of Alberta. Accession No. M-314-22, Scrapbook No. 1, p. 29. Jessie DeGear Fonds, Glenbow Museum Archives.
- Faculty of Education, University of Alberta (2018). About us. Retrieved from: <https://www.ualberta.ca/education/about-us>
- Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa/Université d'Ottawa (2017). 50th anniversary of the faculty: Part 1 - normal schools - precursors to the faculty of Education. Retrieved from: <https://education.uottawa.ca/en/50th/history>
- Farrell, John K. A. (1968). Michael Francis Fallon bishop of London Ontario, Canada 1909-1931: The man and his controversies. *CCHA Study Sessions*, 35(1), 73-90. Retrieved from: <http://www.cchahistory.ca/journal/CCHA1968/Farrell.pdf>
- Federal Council of the League of the Empire (1908). *Report of the federal conference on education, 1907*. Caxton Hall, Westminster, London: League of the Empire Central Offices.
- Féguenne, P. (n.d.). Pierre and Marguerite Féguenne Fonds, 1893-1986. Accession No. PR3404. Provincial Archives of Alberta. Retrieved from: <https://hermis.alberta.ca/paa/Details.aspx?ObjetID=PR3404&dv=True&deptID>

- Foster, R. (1992). *The French immersion choice at high school* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Foster, R. (1998). Profile of a group of "successful" bilingual senior high school students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22(2-4), 201-214. Retrieved from: <http://proquest.umi.com/pdf/5151c7bedafb98de357ebfff0800857f/13315>
- Foster, F. L. (2004). John E. Brownlee. Pp. 77-106. In B.J. Rennie (Ed.) *Alberta premiers of the twentieth century*. Regina, Canada: Canadian Plains Research Centre, University of Regina.
- Foucher, P. (2008). Le droit et la langue française au Canada: évolution et perspectives [The law and the French language in Canada: evolution and perspectives]. *Francophonies d'Amérique*, 26(1), 63-78. doi: 10.7202/037975ar
- Freeman, Edward. A. (1879/1892). Race and language. *Historical essays* [Third series] (2nd ed.). London: McMillan and Co. (Reprinted from *Historical essays* [Third series], 1879, Oxford: Horace Hart, Printer to the University).
- Gaffield, C. (1987). *Language, schooling, and cultural conflict: The origins of the French-language controversy in Ontario*. Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gagnon, A. (1989). The pensionnat Assomption: religious nationalism in a franco-albertan boarding school for girls, 1926-1960. *Historical Studies in Education/ Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 1(1), 95-117. Retrieved from: <http://historicalstudiesineducation.ca/1356-2349-1-PB.pdf>
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London, UK: Edward Arnold
- Gardner, R. C. (1986). *Social psychological aspects of second language learning*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian journal of psychology/ Revue canadienne de psychologie*, 13(4), 266-272.
- Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). Motivation and second-language acquisition. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 31(3), pp. 218-230.
- Genesee, F. (1976). The role of intelligence in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 26(2), 267-280. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1976.tb00277.x
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Genesee, F. (1991). L'immersion et l'apprenant défavorisé [Immersion and the disadvantaged learner]. *Études de linguistique appliquée*, 82(1), 77-93. Retrieved from: <http://media.proquest.com>.

- Gibault, J. L. (1939). *The effect of instruction in French upon the mastery of the English language in English-French schools of the St. Paul inspectorate* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Gidney, R.D. and Millar W.P.J. (2012). *How public schools worked in English Canada, 1900-1940*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Government of Alberta [?]. (1914). *Handbook for Alexandra Readers*. Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada, Ltd. Retrieved from: <http://archive.org/details/alexandrareadersunse?q=Handbook+to+the+Alexandra+Readers>
- Government of Alberta (1922). An Act respecting Schools [the School Act]. Retrieved from: <http://www.ourfutureourpast.ca/law/page.aspx?id=2889539>
- Government of Canada. (1982). Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s. 23. Retrieved from: <http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/pdp-hrp/canada/guide/mnrt-eng.cfm>
- Graham, V. T. (1926). The intelligence of Italian and Jewish children. *The Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 20(4), 371-376. Retrieved from: <http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com>.
- Grégoire, A. (1947). *L'apprentissage du langage: II. La troisième année et les années suivantes* [Language learning: II. The third year and the following years]. Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, Faculté de Philosophie et de Lettres, Université de Liège.
- Green, D. (1978). Multiculturalism in education. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 34(4), 662-667.
- Groulx, L. (1934). *L'enseignement français au Canada, Tome II: Les écoles des minorités (2e édition)*. Montréal, Québec: Librairie Granger Frères Ltée.
- Guba, E. C. (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Guba, E. C., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oakes, California: Sage.
- Guimont, G. (2003). *French immersion in different settings: A comparative study of student achievement and exemplary practices in immersion centres versus dual- and multi-track schools* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Halsall, N. D. (1989). *Immersion/regular program study: research and development*. Nepean, Ontario: Carleton Board of Education.
- Halsall, N. D. (1994). Attrition/retention of students in French immersion with particular emphasis on secondary school. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 50(2), 312-345.

- Halsall, N. D. (1998, November). French immersion: The success story told by research [Conference report keynote address], *French immersion in Alberta: Building the future*. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Learning, Alberta School Boards Association for Bilingual Education, Canadian Parents for French, College of Alberta Superintendents, Faculté Saint-Jean, & The Alberta Teachers' Association. Retrieved from: <http://www.cpf.ca/eng/media-backgrounders-story-told-by-research.html>
- Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge. (Original work published 1989)
- Hammerly, H. (1982, October 14). Parlez-vous Frenglish? *Simon Fraser Week*, p. 2.
- Hammerly, H. (1983, May 21). Frenglish, once learned, impervious to correction [letter to the editor]. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. A5.
- Hammerly, H. (1987). The immersion approach: Litmus test of second language acquisition through classroom communication. *The Modern Language Journal*, 71(4), 395-401.
- Hammerly, H. (1989). *French immersion: Myths and reality. A better classroom road to bilingualism*. Calgary, Canada: Detselig Entreprises Ltd.
- Harrison, R. (2004). History and sociology. In P. Lambert & P. Schofield (Eds.), *Making history: An introduction to the history and practices of a discipline* (pp. 138-149). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hart, E. J., (1981), *Ambitions et réalités: la communauté francophone d'Edmonton 1795-1935*, translated from English by G. Lacombe and G. Allaire. Edmonton, Canada: Le Salon d'histoire de la francophonie albertaine, University of Alberta.
- Hart, D., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (1988). *Early and middle French immersion programs: Linguistic outcomes and social character. Final report on Part I of the research commissioned by the Metropolitan Toronto School Board*. Toronto: OISE, Modern Language Centre.
- Hart, D., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (1989a). *Early and middle French immersion programs: Report on the sub-study of attrition commissioned by the Metropolitan Toronto School Board*. Toronto: OISE, Modern Language Centre.
- Hart, D., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (1989b). Final report to the Calgary Board of Education: Evaluation of continuing bilingual and late immersion programs at the secondary level. Toronto: OISE, Modern Language Centre.
- Hazard, W. R., & Stent, M. D. (1971). Cultural pluralism and schooling: Some preliminary observations. In M. D. Stent, W. R. Hazard, and H. N. Rivlin (Eds.), *Cultural pluralism in Education: A mandate for change* (pp.13-26). New York, USA: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Heller, M. (1990). French immersion in Canada: A model for Switzerland? *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 9(1), 67-85.
- Heritage Community Foundation (2009). La congrégation en Alberta.

- Saint-Joachim/Edmonton. *Oblates in the West – the Alberta story/Les Oblats dans l'Ouest – L'histoire de l'Alberta*. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta Archives. Retrieved from:
<https://wayback.archiveit.org/2217/20101208172733/http://www.albertasource.ca/oblatesinthewest/fr/order/joachim.html>
- Hildebrand, J.F.T. (1974). French immersion pilot program in Fredericton. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 31(2), 181-191.
- Hill, H.S. (1936). The effect of bilingualism on the measured intelligence of elementary school children of Italian parentage. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 5(1), 75-78. Retrieved from: <http://media.proquest.com>.
- Hoogvelt, A. (1997/2001). *Globalization and the postcolonial world: The new political economy of development* (2nd ed.). Great Britain: Palgrave.
- Howell, M. & Prevenier, W. (2001). *Reliable sources: An introduction to historical methods*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Huel, R. (1981/1969). *L'Association Catholique Franco-Canadienne de la Saskatchewan: un rapport contre l'assimilation culturelle 1912-34*. Translated from English and adapted by René Boittiers. Regina, Canada: Les Publications Fransaskoises Ltée.
- Imperial Government (1911). *Report of the imperial education conference 1911*. London, England: His Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Imperial Government (1918). *The Education Act*. (See under A.A. Thomas).
- Imperial Government (1926). *Report of the imperial education conference 1923*. London, England: His Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Imperial Government (1927). *Report of the imperial education conference 1927*. London, England: His Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Jann, W. & Wegrich, K. (2007). Theories of policy cycle. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods* (pp. 43-62). New York: CRC Press.
- Johns, W.H. (1981). *A history of the University of Alberta, 1908-1969*. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta Press.
- Johnson, G. B. (1953). Bilingualism as measured by a reaction-time technique and the relationship between a language and a non-language intelligence quotient. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 82, 3-9. Retrieved from:
<https://serch-proquest-com-login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/docview/1297155591/fulltextPDF/A587554620464329PQ/4?accountid=14474>
- Johnson, R. K., & Swain, M. (1997). Immersion education, a category within bilingual education. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion Education*:

- International perspectives* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, W. R. (1960). Bilingualism and non-verbal intelligence. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 30, 71-77.
- Jones, W. R., & Stewart, W. A. (1951). Bilingualism and verbal intelligence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 4, 3-8.
- Jones, J. P. (1984). Past, present, and future needs in Immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 41(2), 260-267.
- Jones, D. C. (2004). Herbert W. Greenfield. In B.J. Rennie (Ed.) *Alberta Premiers of the Twentieth Century* (pp. 59-76). Regina, Canada: Canadian Plains Research Centre, University of Regina.
- Kaufman, S., & S. Shapson (1978). Overview of secondary and post-secondary French immersion: Issues and research. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 34(3), 604-619.
- Kennedy, H. A. (1909, October 16, Calgary). Letter to A. C. Rutherford, 4 pages. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-7b, Box 3. Government of Alberta, Office of the Premier, General Correspondence. Book and Record Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Kerr, W.A.R. & E. Sonet (1914). *A French Grammar*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada.
- Kerr, W.A.R. (Ed.). (1927). *A Short Anthology of French Canadian Prose Literature*. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Kessler, J. (1919). Review of the report of the committee on the position of modern languages in the educational system of Great Britain. *The Modern Language Journal*. 4(3), 147-148. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/313563>
- King, M. T. (2012). Working in/with the archives. In S. Gunn and Lucy Faire (Eds.) *Research methods for history* (pp.13-29). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Knopff, R., & Morton, F. L. (1985). Nation-building and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In A. Cairns and C. Williams (Eds.) *Constitutionalism, citizenship and society in Canada* (pp. 133-182). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995/2000). *Multicultural citizenship*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism, and citizenship*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). Ethnocultural diversity in a liberal state: Making sense of the Canadian model(s). In K. Banting, T. J. Courchene, & F. L. Seidle (Eds.), *The art of the State, volume III: Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada* (pp. 95-104). Montreal, Canada: Institute for research on public policy (IRPP).

- Lamarre, P. (1996). *A comparative analysis of the development of immersion programs in British-Columbia and Quebec: two divergent sociopolitical contexts* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/pqdtft/docview/304409147/fulltextPDF/142F9739B1213AB25CE/1?accountid=14474>
- Lambert, W. E. (1974). The St. Lambert project. In S. T. Carey (Ed.), *Bilingualism, biculturalism and education: Proceedings from the Conference at collège universitaire Saint-Jean, the University of Alberta* (pp. 231-248). Edmonton, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.
- Lambert, W. E. (1973/1975). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Education of immigrant students: Issues and answers* (pp. 55-83). Toronto, Canada: OISE. (Original work produced in 1973: a paper presented at the Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning, Bellingham, Washington. Paper retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED096820.pdf>)
- Lambert, W.E., & Fillenbaum, S. (1959). A pilot study of aphasia among bilinguals. *Canadian journal of psychology*, 13(1), 28-34. doi:10.1037/h0083764
- Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Barik, H. C., & Turnstall, K. (1963). Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(4), 358-368.
- Lambert, W.E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: the St. Lambert experiment*. Massachusetts, USA: Newbury House Publishers Inc.
- Lamoureux, P. (1974). Bilingual schooling: The Alberta experience. In S. T. Carey (Ed.), *Bilingualism, biculturalism and education: Proceedings from the conference at Collège universitaire Saint-Jean, the University of Alberta* (pp. 179-186). Edmonton, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.
- Lapkin, S., Hart, D., & Swain, M. (1991). Early and middle French immersion programs: French language outcomes. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 48(1), 11-40.
- Lapkin, S., Hart, D., and Turnbull, M. (2003). Grade 6 French immersion students' performance on large-scale reading, writing, and mathematics tests: building explanations. *Alberta journal of educational research*. 49(1), 6-23. Retrieved from: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=579671291&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=12301&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Laurie, S. S. (1889/1904). *Lectures on language and linguistic method in the school. Delivered in the University of Cambridge, Easter term, 1889* (4th ed.). London, UK: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., Limited.
- Lavallée, M. (1980). L'enseignement bilingue en Alberta depuis les années 1920 [Bilingual teaching in Alberta since the 1920s]. In A. Trottier, K. J. Munro and G. Allaire (Eds.), *Aspects du passé franco-albertain* (pp. 37-42). Edmonton, Canada:

- Le Salon d'histoire de la francophonie albertaine, Faculté Saint-Jean, University of Alberta.
- Lavallée, B. (1990). *Teacher talk: The role of language and paralinguage in a French immersion kindergarten* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Lazaruk, W. (2007). Linguistic, academic, and cognitive benefits of French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 63(5), 605-628. Retrieved from: <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&hid=lo&sid=36526683-bf9f-4f5f-a428-83a7d2674975%40sessionmgr>
- League of the Empire (1907). Invitation by Mrs. Ord Marshal, Hon. Secretary, to Premier Rutherford to join Representative Council of the League. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-5a, Box 1, Department of Education, 1906-1913. Book and Record Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- League of the Empire (1908[?]). Minutes of meeting in Edmonton Government buildings April 29th. Accession No. PR1975.0518/20, File No. 20, 8 pages. Provincial Archives of Alberta Archives.
- League of Empire, President and Council. (1915a). Invitation to the third annual meeting of the Teachers' Associations of the British Empire. Accession No. M-314-22, Scrapbook No. 1, p. 40. Jessie DeGear Fonds, Glenbow Museum Archives.
- League of Empire, President and Council. (1915b). Invitation to a reception with Representatives of the Imperial Union of Teachers and Visitors from Overseas Dominions. Accession No. M-314-22, Scrapbook No. 1, p. 131. Jessie DeGear Fonds, Glenbow Museum Archives.
- Leathes, S. M. et al. (1918). *Modern Studies: The Report of the Committee on the Position of Modern Languages in the Educational System of Great Britain*. [Parliament Papers by command] Cd. 9036.. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. Retrieved from: <http://m.hathitrust.org/Record/000202048>
- Legislature of Alberta Library (1907). *Report of the Provincial Librarian to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, for the year ending December 31, 1907*. Edmonton, Canada: Provincial Library of Alberta. Retrieved from email exchange with librarians Jill Barnett and Heather Close, Library.Requests@assembly.ca , dated February 19th, 2016.
- Legislature of Alberta Library (1924). *Report of the Librarian, to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, on the state of the Library at the present date February 27, 1924*. Edmonton, Canada: Provincial Library of Alberta. Retrieved from email exchange with librarians Jill Barnett and Heather Close, Library.Requests@assembly.ca , dated February 19th, 2016.
- Legislature of Alberta Library (1931). *Report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly on the state of the Library, January 1931*. Edmonton, Canada: Provincial Library of Alberta. Retrieved from email exchange with librarians Jill Barnett and Heather Close, Library.Requests@assembly.ca , dated February 19th, 2016.

- Leopold, W. F. (1939). *Speech development of a bilingual child* [Vol.1]. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Leopold, W.F. (1949). *Speech development of a bilingual child* [Vol.3]. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Levasseur-Ouimet, F. (2003). *D'année en année de 1659 à 2000: Une présentation synchronique des événements historiques franco-albertains* [From year to year, starting in 1659 until 2000: A synchronic presentation of historical franco-albertan events]. Edmonton, Canada: l'Institut du Patrimoine de la Faculté Saint-Jean, DeJong Printing Ltd.
- Lévesque, G. (2014). Les droits linguistiques selon Henri Bourassa [Linguistic rights according to Henri Bourassa], *Le Franco*. July 31-August 6, Vol. 48, No. 27, p. 4.
- Levinson, B. M. (1959). A comparison of the performance of bilingual and monolingual native born Jewish preschool children of traditional parentage on four intelligence tests. *The Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 15(1), 74-76. Retrieved from: <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=8&sid=2267fb9f-0bc3-46f9-85e0-34310ec41214%40sessionmgr115&hid=115>
- Lewis, D. G. (1960). Differences in attainment between primary schools in mixed-language areas: Their dependence on intelligence and linguistic background. *The British journal of educational psychology*, 30, 63-70.
- MacFarlane, J. (1999). Ernest Lapointe and Quebec's influence on Canadian foreign policy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Macnamara, J. T. (1966). *Bilingualism and primary education: a study of the Irish experience*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Macheachran, J.M. (1945). William Alexander Robb Kerr, M.A., Ph.D, LL.D., F.R.S.C. Officer d'Instruction Publique, Chevalier d'Honneur. *History Trails*. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta Alumni Association. Retrieved from: <https://sites.ualberta.ca/ALUMNI/history/peopleh-o/45AprKerr.htm>
- Mady, C., Black, G. and Fulton, K. (2010). Review of ministry of education policies affecting equitable access to FSL programs [Supplemental material: full report]. *The state of French-second-language education in Canada 2010: Executive Summary* (pp. 10-12). Canada: CPF. Retrieved from: http://www.cpf.ca/eng/resources-reports-fsl/POLICY_FULL_Report_revised_MRW_6July_2_.pdf
- Mady, C. and Turnbull, M. (2012). Official language bilingualism for Allophones in Canada: Exploring future research. *TESL Canada Journal/ revue TESL du Canada*, 29(2), 131-142. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ981500.pdf>
- Mady, C. (2013). Adding languages, adding benefits: Immigrant students' attitudes toward and performance in FSOL programs in Canada. In K. Arnett and C. Mady (Eds.), *Minority Populations in Canadian Second Language Education* (pp. 3-21). Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

- Mahé, Y. T. M. (1993). L'idéologie, le curriculum et les enseignants des écoles bilingues de l'Alberta, 1892-1992 [Ideology, curriculum, and teachers in bilingual schools of Alberta, 1892-1992]. *La revue canadienne des langues vivantes/ The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 49(4), 687-703.
- Mahé, Y. T. M. (1997). Bilingual school district trustees and cultural transmission: The Alberta experience, 1892-1939. *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 9(1), 65-82.
- Mahé, Y. T. M. (2000). Bilingual school teachers' cultural mission and practices in Alberta before 1940. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 34(2), 135-163. Retrieved on line at:
- Mahé, Y. T. M. (2001). Official and unofficial school inspection as hegemonic and counter-hegemonic struggle in Prairie district before 1940. *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*, 33(2), 31-52.
- Mahé, Y. T. M. (2002). French teacher shortages and cultural continuity in Alberta districts, 1892-1940. *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 14(2), 219-246.
- Mahé, Y. T. M. (2004). "La Survivance" discourses and the curriculum in French-speaking communities in North America, 1840-1960. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 38(2), 183-207.
- Makropoulos, J. (1998). *Sociopolitical analysis of French immersion developments in Canada* (Unpublished master's thesis). OISE, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Makropoulos, J. (2002). The French immersion debate: French for all or all for French by J-M. Mannavarayan. *Canadian Journal of Education/ Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 27(4), 525-527.
- Mallea, J. R. (1985). Educational structures: Alternatives. In A. Martel (Ed.), *Constitutional rights for minorities and a changing education structure in Alberta: Proceedings of the minority language education rights and the Constitution conference* (pp. 35-55). Edmonton: Publication Services, University of Alberta.
- Malherbe, E. G. (1946/1978). *The bilingual school: A study of bilingualism in South Africa*. New York: Arno Press. (Reprinted from *The bilingual school: A study of bilingualism in South Africa*, 1946, London, UK: Longmans Green & Co.
- Manzer, R. (1994). *Public schools and political ideas: Canadian educational policy in historical perspective*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Manzer, R. (2003). *Educational regimes and anglo-american democracy*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Marshall, S., & Laghzaoui, G. (2012). Langues, identités et francophonie chez des étudiants universitaires issus d'immersion française à Vancouver, au Canada [Languages, identities and Francophonie among FI educated university students in

- Vancouver, Canada]. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 68(2), 217-233. doi: 10.1353/cml.2012.0001.
- Martel, A. (1991). *Official language minority education rights in Canada: From instruction to management*. Ottawa : Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages.
- Martin, P. (1993). Citizenship and the people's world. In W. Kaplan's (Ed.), *Belonging: The meaning and future of Canadian citizenship* (pp. 64 -78). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Marwick, A. (1970/1989). *The nature of history* (3rd edition). Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.
- McCarthy, D. (1929). *The language development of the preschool child*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCulloch, G. (2004). *Documentary research in education, history and the social sciences*. London, UK: Routledge Falmer.
- McCulloch, G., & Richardson, W. (2000). *Historical research in educational settings*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- McDowell, D. (2013, December 15). Dunn, sir James Hamet. *Encyclopédie Canadienne*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.encyclopediecanadienne.ca/fr/m/article/dunn-sir-james-hamet/>
- McLellan, A. A. (1985). Minority language educational rights and the right to equality: Are they mutually exclusive? In A. Martel (Ed.), *Constitutional rights for minorities and a changing education structure in Alberta: Proceedings of the minority language education rights and the Constitution conference*. Edmonton: Publication Services, University of Alberta.
- McLeod, K. A. (1979). Politics, schools and the French language, 1881-1931. In David C. Jones, Nancy M. Sheehan, and Robert M. Stamp (Eds), *Shaping the schools of the Canadian West* (pp. 59-83). The University of Calgary, Detselig Enterprises Ltd: Calgary, Canada.
- McMurtry, R. (2007). Accomodating Canada's diversity. In K. Banting, T. J. Courchene, and F. L. Seidle (Eds.), *The art of the State, volume III: Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada* (pp. 87-94). Montreal, Canada: Institute for research on public policy (IRPP).
- Meade, M. (1927). Educational research and statistics: Group intelligence tests and linguistic disability among Italian children. *School and Society*, 25(642), 465-468.
- Merchant, F. W. (1912). *Report on the condition of English-French schools in the province of Ontario*. Toronto: King's Printer.
- Merchant, F.W., Scott, J.H. & Côté, L. (1927). *Report of the Committee appointed to enquire into the condition of the schools attended by French-speaking pupils*. Toronto: King's Printer.

- Merriam, S. B. (1998). Case studies as qualitative research. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* [Revised and expanded from *Case study research in education*]. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mitchell, A. J. (1937). The effect of bilingualism in the measurement of intelligence. *The Elementary School Journal*, 38(1), 29-37.
- Morton, D. (1993). Divided loyalties? Divided country? In W. Kaplan's (Ed.), *Belonging: The meaning and future of Canadian citizenship* (pp. 50-63). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Morton, L. L., Lemieux, C., Diffey, N., & Awender, M.A. (1999). Determinants of withdrawal from bilingual career track when entering high school. *Guidance and counseling*, 14(3), 14 pp [HTML Full Text format]. Retrieved from: <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?hid=104&sid=8bbfe266-c7e8-4c25-a0f8-0258e1c95c5d%40sessionmgr114&vid=5>
- Munro, K. (1987). Official bilingualism in Alberta. *Prairie Forum*, 12(1), 37-47.
- Naastad Strøm, K.O. (2012). The devil to pay: Kristiansand Nikkelraffineringsverk, the British America Nickel Corporation and Economic Warfare 1914-1918. Master's Thesis. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology. Retrieved from: https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/243013/536125_FULLTEXT.pdf?sequence=1
- Noël, M. (1989). Bilinguisme, ethnicité et société [Bilingualism, ethnicity and society]. *Bilinguisme et enseignement du français*. G. Morcos (Ed.), 61-78. Montréal: Éditions du Méridien.
- Noël, F. (2012). The impact of Regulation 17 on the study of district schools: Some methodological considerations. *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire d'éducation*. 24(1), 72-92. [Special issue/numéro spécial].
- Obadia, A., Roy, R. Saunders, B. Tafler, R. and Wilton, F. (1983). Étude nationale sur la formation et le perfectionnement du professeur d'immersion française [National study on the training and professionalization of the French immersion teacher]. *La revue canadienne des langues vivantes/ The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 39(1), 203-225.
- Obadia, A. A. (1984a). Le professeur d'immersion, le pivot du nouveau bilinguisme au Canada [The immersion teacher as the pivotal point of the new bilingualism in Canada]. *La revue canadienne des langues vivantes/ The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41(2), 376-387.
- Obadia A. A. (1984b, Winter). The teachers, key to the success story. *Language and Society*, 12, 15-19.
- Obadia, A. A. and Thériault, C.M.L. (1997). Attrition in French immersion programs: Possible solutions. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 53(3), 506-529.

- Official Languages Committee (2018). *Official Languages Committee on March 1st, 2018: Evidence of meeting #92 for Official Languages in the 42nd Parliament, 1st session*. Retrieved from:
<https://openparliament.ca/committees/official-languages/42-1/92/victoria-wishart-1/?page=7>
- Ollivier, M. (Ed.) (1954). *The colonial and imperial conferences from 1887 To 1937*, vol. III, part II. Ottawa, Canada: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery.
- Pagé, S. (2015). Le lieutenant-colonel Édouard Leprohon et les difficultés de recrutement du 233^e bataillon Canadiens-français du Nord-Ouest (1916-1918) [Lieutenant-colonel Édouard Leprohon and the difficulties in the recruitment of the 233rd Battalion Canadiens-français du Nord-Ouest]. *Avant que j'oublie*, Vol. 6, No. 6. In *Le Franco*. February 5-11, Vol. 48[?], No. 15 [?], pp. 7-9.
 Retrieved from:
https://www.shfa.ca/fichiers/ressources/aqjo/volume_6/201502_v6_no6.pdf
- Pal, L. A. (1993). *Interests of state: The politics of language, multiculturalism and feminism in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Pariseau, J. & Bernier, S. (1986). French Canadians and bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces, Volume I, 1769-1969: the fear of a parallel army. Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services Canada. Retrieved from:
http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/docs/bilingualism/_cf_vol1_e.pdf
- Parmelee, G. W. (1914). *English education in Quebec: Reprinted from Canada and its Provinces: A History of the Canadian people and their institutions by One Hundred Associates*. Quebec, Canada: Adam Shortt and A.G. Doughty, Department of Public Instruction.
- Pavlovitch, M. (1920). *Le langage enfantin: Acquisition du serbe et du français par un enfant Serbe* [Childish language: Acquisition of the Serbian and French languages by a Serbian child]. Champion: Paris.
- Peal, E. and Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76(27), 1-23.
- Penfield, W. (1965). Conditioning the uncommitted cortex for language learning. *Brain*, 88(4), 787-798.
- Pintner, R. and Keller, R. (1922). Intelligence tests of foreign children. *Journal of educational psychology*. 13(4), 214-222. Retrieved from:
<http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com.l>
- Pintner, R. (1932). The influence of language background on intelligence tests. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1(3), 235-240. Retrieved from:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/pdf/10.1080/00224545.1932.9919147>
- Pintner, R. and Arsenian, S. (1937). The relation of bilingualism to verbal intelligence and school adjustment. *Journal of Educational Research*, 31(4), 255-263.
 Retrieved from: <http://pao.chadwyck.com/PDF/11353458361688.pdf>

- Pons-Ridler, S. (1977). Introduction précoce de la langue seconde. Expérience suisse: exemple à suivre? [Early second language introduction. The Swiss example: an example to follow?]. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 33(4), 453-458.
- Powell, A. J. H. (2013). “ ‘Fighting’ John Barnett”. *ATA Magazine*, 94(2). Retrieved on line at: <https://www.teachers.ab.ca>
- Prasad, G. (2012). Multiple minorities or culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) plurilingual learners? Re-envisioning Allophone immigrant children and their inclusion in French-language schools in Ontario. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 68(2), 190-215. Retrieved from: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/canadian_modern_language_review/v068/68.2.prasad.html
- Rahikainen, M., & Fellman, S. (2012). On historical writing and evidence. In S. Fellman & M. Rahikainen (Eds.), *Historical knowledge: In quest of theory, method and evidence* (pp. 5-44). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Riches, C. and Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2010). A tale of two Montreal communities: Parents’ perspectives on their children’s language and literacy development in a multilingual context. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(4), 526-555. Retrieved from: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/canadian_modern_language_review/v066/66.4.riches.html
- Romaine, S. (2004). The bilingual and multilingual community. In T. K. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 607-641). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le développement du langage observe chez l’enfant bilingue* [The development of language in the bilingual child]. Paris: Champion. Retrieved from: <http://ebooks.library.ualberta.ca/local/ledeveloppementooronjuoft>
- Rouleau, E. H. (1909, October 15, Calgary). Letter to A.C. Rutherford, premier and minister of education in Edmonton, 2 pages. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-5b, Box 2. Government of Alberta, Departments and Offices, Normal School. Book and Record Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Roy, S. (2007). Apprendre une langue seconde: les théories socio-culturelles et la sociolinguistique du changement [Learning a second language: sociocultural theories and sociolinguistics of change]. *Education Canada*, 47(1), 25-29. Retrieved from: <http://proquest.umi.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/pqdweb?did=1199321261&Fmt=4&clientId=12301&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Roy, S. (2008). French immersion studies: from second-language acquisition (SLA) to social issues. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 54(4), 396-407.
- Rutherford, A.C. (1908). *Budget speech delivered by Hon. A.C. Rutherford, prime minister and provincial treasurer of Alberta, February 25, 1908*, p. 23.

- Edmonton, Alberta: Jas. E. Richards, Government Printer. Accession No. 2315-4, Book and Record Depository, University of Alberta.
- Rutherford, A. C. (1912, May 28, Strathcona). Letter to Howard Angus Kennedy, 2 pages. Accession No. 69-164, Item No. 2/3/3/3-7b, Box 3. Government of Alberta, Office of the Premier, General Correspondence. Book and Record Depository, University of Alberta Archives.
- Rusak, S. T. (1966). *Relations in education between Bishop Legal and the Alberta liberal government, 1905-1920* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Saer, D.J. (1923). The effects of bilingualism on intelligence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 14(1), 25-38.
- Saer, D. J., Smith, F., and Hughes, J. (1924). *The bilingual problem: A study based upon experiments and observations in Wales*. Wrexham: Hughes and Son Ltd.
- Safty, A. (1988). French immersion and the making of a bilingual society: A critical review and discussion. *Canadian Journal of Education/ Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 13(2), 243-262. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/stable/pdfplus/1494954.pdf?acceptTC=true&acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm=true>
- Safty, A. (1992). Effectiveness and French immersion: A socio-political analysis. *Canadian Journal of Education/ Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 17(1), 23-32.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). Judging interpretations. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 1(114), pp.11-15. doi:10.1002/ev.223
- Scott, J. H., Merchant & Côté Commission Report (1927). [See under Merchant, Scott & Côté as F. W. Merchant was the chairperson].
- Shapson, S. & Kaufman, D. (1978). Overview of elementary French programs in British Columbia: Issues and research. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 34(3), 586-604.
- Sheehan, N. M. (1990). Philosophy, pedagogy, and practice: The IODE and the schools in Canada, 1900-1945. *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 2(2), 307-321.
- Sissons, C. B. (1917). *Bilingual schools in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: Dent and Sons Ltd.
- Skocpol, T. (1984). Emerging agendas and recurrent strategies in historical sociology. In T. Skocpol (Ed.), *Vision and method in historical sociology* (pp. 356-391). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Skogen, R. M. (2006). *Holding the tension in the sphere of the between: French immersion graduates in a Francophone post secondary institution* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Smith, F. (1923). Bilingualism and mental development. *British Journal of Psychology*, 13(3) 271-282.

- Smith, M. E. (1939). Some light on the problem of bilingualism as found from a study of the progress in mastery of English among preschool children of non-American ancestry in Hawaii. *Genetic Psychology Monographs: Child behavior, animal behavior and comparative psychology*, 21(2), 119-284.
- Société historique francophone de l'Alberta (n.d.). Le Courrier de l'Ouest (1905-1926). *L'histoire de votre Alberta* [History of your Alberta]. Edmonton, Canada: La société historique de l'Alberta. Retrieved from: <https://www.shfa.ca/ressources-historiques/journaux-francophones/le-courrier-de-l-ouest>
- Sparby, H. (1958). *A history of the Alberta school system to 1925*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Xerox University Microfilms.
- Spoerl, D. T. (1944). The academic and verbal adjustment of college age bilingual students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 64(1), 139-157. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/docview/1297114952/fulltextPDF/142F9D16DC8547AEC2B/1?accountid=14474>
- Stark, W. A. (1940). The effect of bilingualism on general intelligence: an investigation carried out in certain Dublin primary schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 10(1), 78-79.
- Stern, H. H. (1970). *Perspectives on second language teaching*. Toronto: OISE, University of Toronto.
- Stern, H. H. (1978). Language research and the classroom practitioner. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 34(4), 680-687.
- Stephenson, M. (2010). Learning about empire and the imperial education conferences in the early twentieth century: creating cohesion or demonstrating difference? *History of Education Review*, 39(2), 24-35. Retrieved at: <https://eds.a.ebscohost.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&siel=4c27c24d-b662-4a50-8610-340dc159d446%40sessionmgr4009>
- Sutherland, N. (1987/2000). *Children in English-Canadian society: Framing the twentieth century consensus*. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Press.
- Swain, M. (1974). French immersion programs across Canada: Research findings. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 31(2), 117-129.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: a Canadian case study*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 169-186.
- Swerhun, S. (1981). *Guidelines for bicultural education of minority group children in Alberta* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

- Tardif, C. (1984). La formation des enseignants en situation d'immersion [Teacher training in the immersion context]. *La revue canadienne des langues vivantes/The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41(2), 365-375.
- Tardif, C. (1990). French language minority education: Political and pedagogical issues. *Canadian Journal Of Education/ Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 15(4), 400-412. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1495113>
- Tardif, C., & Weber, S. (1987). French immersion research: A call for new perspectives. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 44(1), 67-77.
- Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(2), 166-178. Retrieved from: <http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=0000307783&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Taylor, S. (1992). Victor: A case of a Cantonese child in early French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 48(4), 736-757.
- Tepper, S. J. (2004). Setting agendas and designing alternatives: policymaking and the strategic role of meetings. *Review of Policy Research*, 21, 523-542. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-1338.2004.00092.x.
- Thomas, A. A. (1919). *The Education Act, 1918: A handbook for the use of administrators, members of local education authorities, school managers and others interested in education, as well as for the legal profession, to which is appended the complete text of the Act*. Westminster, England: P.S. King & Son Ltd. Retrieved from: <http://www.archive.org/details/educationact191800thomuoft>
- Thompson, J. H., & Seager, A. (1985). *Canada 1922-1939: decades of discord*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Tomkins, G. S. (1985/2008). *A common countenance: stability and change in the Canadian curriculum*. Vancouver, Canada: Pacific Educational Press.
- Torres, C.A. (2009). *Education and neoliberal globalization*. NY: Routledge.
- Toussaint, N. (1935). *Bilinguisme et éducation* [Bilingualism and education]. Bruxelles: Lamertin.
- Trites, R. L. (1976). Children with learning disabilities in primary French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 33(1), 193-201.
- von Heyking, A. (2006). Fostering a provincial identity: two eras in Alberta schooling. *Canadian Journal of Education* 29 (4), pp. 1127-1156.
- Webber, K. (1990). *Six immersion students and their language learning styles* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Wellington, J. (2000). *Educational research: contemporary issues and practical approaches*. London, UK: Continuum.

- Whitehead, C. (2007). The concept of British education policy in the colonies 1850-1960. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 39, 161-173.
doi: 10.1080/00220620701342296
- Whitehead, C. (1995). The medium of instruction of instruction in British colonial education: a case of cultural imperialism or enlightened paternalism? *History of Education*, 24, 1-15. doi: 1080/0046760950240101
- Whiteman, B, Stewart, C. & C. Funnell (1985). *A Bibliography of MacMillan of Canada Imprints 1906-1980*. Dundurn Press: Toronto & London.
- Williamson, P. (1982). 'Safety first': Baldwin, the conservative party, and the 1929 general election. *The Historical Journal*, 25, 385-409.
doi: 10.1017/S0018246X00011614
- Williams, C. (1985). The changing nature of citizen rights. In A. Cairns & C. Williams (Eds.), *Constitutionalism, citizenship and society in Canada* (p. 99-131). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Wilson, L.J. (1977). Perren Baker and Alberta's school district reorganization. *The Canadian Journal of Education/ La revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 2(3), 25-36.
- Wood, W. R., & Williamson, J. (2007). Comparative historical sociology. In C.D. Bryant & Dennis L. Peck (Eds.), *21st Century sociology: A reference handbook* (pp. 118-128). Thousand Oakes: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oakes: Sage Publications Inc.
- Yoshioka, J. G. (1929). A study of bilingualism. *Journal of genetic psychology*, 36(3), 473-479. doi: 10.1080/08856559.1929.10532205

Newspapers

(Newspapers listed alphabetically; articles listed from earliest to latest date)

The Calgary Albertan:

Brownlee replies to his critics. (1928, March 2). *The Calgary Albertan*, n.p., Alberta Legislature Library Scrapbook Hansard Collection. Retrieved from:
https://librarysearch.assembly.ab.ca/client/en_CA/search/asset/29242/0

Perren Baker Asserts North Needs Normal. (1928, March 9). *The Calgary Albertan*, n. p., Alberta Legislature Library Scrapbook Hansard Collection. Retrieved from:

The Calgary Herald:

Ferguson, E. (2017, September 8). Frustrated Calgary parents hire private bus service in wake of CBE transportation changes. *The Calgary Herald*, n.p. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.ca/amp/calgaryherald.com/news/local-news/frustrated-calgary-parents-hire-private-bus-service-in-wake-of-cbe-transportation-charges/amp>

Le Courrier de l'Ouest:

La prospérité de l'Alberta traduite en chiffres [Alberta's prosperity translated into numbers]. (1907, March 14). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 23, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Sratchcona. (1907, May 2). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 30, p. 6. Document Ar00600, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Société St-Jean Baptiste [Society of Saint-John the Baptist]. (1907, May 16). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 32, p. 6. Document Ar00600, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Il y a tant de gens qui arrivent que 2,000 vivent sous des tentes [There are so many people arriving that 2,000 live in tents]. (1907, June 13). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 36, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Un beau discours [A nice speech]. (1907, July 11). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 40, p. 4. Document Ar00400, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Mr. [sic] Bourassa et les provinces de l'ouest [Mr. Bourassa and the western provinces]. (1907a, July 25). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 42, p. 4. Document Ar00401, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Sir Wilfrid de retour au Canada [Sir Wilfrid back in Canada]. (1907b, July 25). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 42, p. 1. Document Ar00101, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

L'Hon. M. Rutherford, premier ministre de la province [The Hon. Mr. Rutherford, Premier of the province]. (1907, August 8). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2 No. 44, p. 1. Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Communication de la commission du charbon [News from the coal commission]. (1907,

- August 15). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 2, No. 45, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta
- Sir Wilfrid Laurier parle en faveur de la réciprocité [Sir Wilfrid Laurier speaks in favor of reciprocity]. (1911, March 9). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 22, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Les Orangistes et les écoles bilingues [Orangemen and the bilingual schools]. (1911, March 23). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 24, p. 4. Document Ar00402, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Tribune libre [Letter to the editor]. (1911, April 13). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 27, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le français dans les nouvelles provinces [The French language in new parishes]. (1911, April 20). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 28, p. 4. Document Ar00401, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- L'hon. sénateur Roy [The Hon. senator Roy]. (1911, April 27). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 29, p. 1. Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- L'hon. Ph. Roy est nommé commissaire du Canada à Paris [The Hon. Ph. Roy is named Commissioner of Canada in Paris]. (1911, May 4). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 30, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Banquet d'adieu à l'hon. Ph. Roy [Farewell banquet for the Hon. Ph. Roy]. (1911, May 11). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 31, p. 1. Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- De Camrose à Strathcona [From Camrose to Strathcona]. (1911a, May 25). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 33, p. 1. Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- En l'honneur de l'hon. M. Roy [In honor of the Hon. Mr. Roy]. (1911b, May 25). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 33, p. 1. Document Ar00109, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- On demande [We are asking]. (1911c, May 25). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 33, p. 5. Document Ar00500, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- La popularité de sir Wilfrid [The popularity of Sir Wilfrid]. (1911, June 8). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 35, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

La conférence impériale et la part qu'y prend sir Wilfrid [The imperial conference and Sir Wilfrid's part]. (1911a, June 15). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 36, p. 4. Document Ar00401, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier et l'hon. M. Roy [Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. Mr. Roy]. (1911b, June 15). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 36, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Le timbre à deux cents entre la France et le Canada [The two cents stamp between France and Canada]. (1911, June 29). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 38, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

L'hon. A. Turgeon en Belgique [The hon. A. Turgeon in Belgium]. (1911, July 6). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 39, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

L'oeuvre de sir Wilfrid Laurier [The work of Sir Wilfrid Laurier]. (1911, July 13). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 40, p. 4. Document Ar00400, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Les lettres à deux cents entre la France et le Canada [Two cents letters between France and Canada]. (1911, July 20). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 41, p. 1. Document Ar00109, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

De retour de Cleveland [Back from Cleveland]. (1911, July 27). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, Vol. 6, No. 42, p. 1. Document Ar00101, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Pour les persécutés d'Ontario: Les voix des Canadiens-français d'Alberta [For the persecuted of Ontario: The voices of the French Canadians of Alberta]. (1915, February 4). *Le Courrier de l'Ouest*, [Vol. 11?], No. 15, p.1. Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

The Edmonton Bulletin:

Premier Rutherford banqueted by fellow citizens in Strathcona. (1907, May 4). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 24, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Britishers are taking notice. (1907, June 27). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 43, p. 1. Document Ar00126, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Hon. Cross dined by liberal officers. (1907, June 28). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 44, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Education in this province. (1907, July 30). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 78, p. 1. Document Ar00123, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Balfour attacks the ambassador. (1911, March 9). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 205, p. 4 Document Ar00409, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Canada bond between Britain and the US. (1911, April 7). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 230, p. 2. Document Ar00209, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Senator Roy, the Canadian high commissioner at Paris. (1911, May 1). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 250, p. 1. Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Campaign of education to be conducted to offset the monied onslaught on reciprocity. (1911, May 6). *Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 255, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Premier Laurier stirs England by his British-to-the-core words. (1911, June 21). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 293, p. 1. Document Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Premier explains new railway legislation proposed for this year. (1915, March 31). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 286, pp. 1-2. Document Ar00113, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

French-Canadians are not slackers. (1918, February 15). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 151, p. 5. Document Ar00511, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Salient points of Education Act reviewed. (1918, February 23). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 157, p. 3. Document Ar00312, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

People asked to help spot all slackers. (1918, March 1). *The Edmonton Bulletin* Vol. 8, No. 162, p. 3. Document Ar00308, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Summer school is commenced at University. (1918, July 6). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 270, p. 2. Document Ar00205, University of Alberta, Peel's Prairie Provinces.

Nat'l [sic] council of education opens meeting. (1923, April 5). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 285, p. 1. Document Ar00113, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Fine oratory at convention nat'l [sic] council of education. (1923, April 6). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 286, p. 1. Document Ar00107, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

To discuss imperial conference. (1923, June 6). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 14, No. 31, p. 3. Document Ar00316, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Imperial conference to open Monday in chaos, speculation, conjecture. (1923, October 1). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 14, No. 128, p. 1. Document Ar00119, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Conferences nearing close; one finished (1923, November 9). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, Vol. 14, No. 162, p. 1. Document Ar00119, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Literature to retain basis international. (1927, March 17). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, n.p., Alberta Legislature Library Scrapbook Hansard Collection. Retrieved from: https://librarysearch.assembly.ab.ca/client/en_CA/search/asset/26105/0

School Acts amendments delayed. (1927, March 25). *The Edmonton Bulletin*, n.p., Alberta Legislature Library Scrapbook Hansard Collection. Retrieved from: https://librarysearch.assembly.ab.ca/client/en_CA/search/asset/26053/0

The Edmonton Journal:

Province will endeavor to keep rural schools supplied with teachers. (1922, March 11). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 201, p. 11. Box 73, Edmonton Public Library.

End of educationalists' convention in Toronto. (1923, April 7). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 223, p. 17. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.

Alberta Legislature discusses budget. (1923a, April 10). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 225, p. 10. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.

Lord Robert Cecil's address in Ottawa. (1923b, April 10). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 225, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.

Boy scout trip to England. (1923, April 11). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 226, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.

- Baden-Powell luncheon in Edmonton. (1923, April 16). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 230, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- [Advertisement] Sir Michael Sadler. (1923a, April 21). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 235, p. 16. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Visiting academic from Leeds University. (1923b, April 21). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 235, p. 6. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Sir Michael Sadler. (1923b, April 24). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 237, p. 8. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Liberal education was defined by Vice-Chancellor. (1923, April 25). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 238, p. 6. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Wedding of Duke and Duchess of York. (1923, April 26). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 239, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- French club meeting. (1923, October 22). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 83, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- London Times cable service. (1923, November 3). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 101, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Main imperial conference issues official summary; Many resolutions passed. (1923, November 13). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 101, p. 10. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- \$500 grant to each teacher rural school. (1925, April 10). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 226, p. 3. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- No dearth of teachers – Alberta schools well supplied. (1926, September 2). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 39, p. 9. Box 100, Edmonton Public Library.
- Canadian delegation in Geneva. (1926, October 8). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 69, p. 26. [Photo including Philippe Roy]. Box 100, Edmonton Public Library.

- Bowman, C. (1926, November 3). Is Britain a member of League? *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 91, p. 2. Box 101, Edmonton Public Library.
- Hambleton, G. (1926, November 3). Can satisfy Hertzog without change to empire. *Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 91, p. 2. Box 101, Edmonton Public Library.
- Too much power for minister under new Act claims Giroux. (1927, March 8). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 195, p. 16. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Strong language by Orange leader. (1927, March 10). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 197, p. 20. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Makes plea for separate schools. (1927, March 16). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 202, p. 2. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Keep records in French is Giroux's idea. (1927, March 17). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 203, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Conference on education in London in June (1927, April 6). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 220, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Alberta's representative in London. (1927, April 6). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 220, p. 13. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Would lengthen hours for French. (1927, April 20). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 232, p. 15. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Greenfield working hard for Alberta. (1927, April 27). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 238, p. 13.
- Happy associations are fast drawing to a close. (1927, May 30). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 265, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Bailey, H. (1927, July 4). Baldwin to pick envoy to Canada. *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 294, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Complete set of Confederation jubilee stamps. (1927, July 4). *The Edmonton Journal*,

- Vol. 23, No. 294, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Wetaskiwin's novel diamond jubilee. (1927, July 5). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 295, p. 1. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Montreal University excursions feted during Edmonton visit. (1927, July 25). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 9, p. 10. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- French course in historic Quebec popular (1927, July 27). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 11, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Edmonton girl awarded French government bursary. (1927a, July 30). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 14, p. 6. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Hungarians in West successful. (1927b, July 30). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 14, p. 5. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- \$200,000.00 Edmonton Normal School will be complete in 1929. (1928, March 9). *The Edmonton Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 200, p. 7. Accession No. 68.218, File No. 39D, Provincial Archives of Alberta.
- Former world wheat king murdered in California olive grove. (1945, September 2). *The Edmonton Journal*. n.p. Retrieved from: <http://edmontonjournal.com/news/local-news/september-2-1945-former-wheat-king-murdered-in-california-olive-grove>
- French, J. (2017, September 22). Edmonton parents peeved by school bus fees discrepancy. *The Edmonton Journal*. n.p. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.ca/amp/edmontonjournal.com/local-news/edmonton-parents-peeved-by-school-bus-fees-discrepancy/amp>
- The Gateway:
- Department of modern languages to present Le voyage de M. Perrichon. (1920, March 11) *The Gateway*, Vol. 10, No. 17, p. 2. Document Ar00200, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Parlez-vous français? [Do you speak French ?]. (1921, November 11). *The Gateway*, Vol. 12, No. 4, p.6. Document Ar00601, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of

Alberta.

Debate Society. (1922, February 14). *The Gateway*, Vol. 12, No. 12, p. 2. Document Ar00204, University of Alberta, Peel's Prairie Provinces.

Students' tours to old lands. (1922, March 14). *The Gateway*, Vol. 12, No. 16, p.1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Mr. Gibbs at French club. (1923, January 23). *The Gateway*, Vol. 13, No. 12, p. 4. Document Ar00404, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

May convocation results revealed. (1923, October 23). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 4, p. 4. Document Ar00405, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Two lively sessions of the student parliament. (1923, December 4). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 9, pp. 1, 3. Document Ar00100, Document Ar00301, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Arthur Morgan wins scholarship. (1923, December 11). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 10, p. 1. Document Ar00109, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

French evening greatly enjoyed. (1924a, January 8). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 11, pp. 1, 3. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Travellers find French difficult. (1924, January 15). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 12, p. 1, Document Ar00101, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Govt. emerges victorious. (1924a, January 29). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 14, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

French club discuss language. (1924, March 27). *The Gateway*, Vol. 14, No. 20, p. 1. Document Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Traditions play important role. (1924, November 5). *The Gateway*, Vol. 5, No. 5, p. 4. Document Ar00405, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Distinguished Alberta students at Paris. (1924b, November 26). *The Gateway*, Vol. 15, No. 8, p. 2. Document Ar00208, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Messrs. Molson and McDonald of imperial team visit country. (1926, March 4). *The Gateway*, Vol. 16, No. 18, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

The university now broadcasts weekly program. (1926, October 14). *The Gateway*, Vol. 17, No. 2, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

- Urges bilingual school as means towards unity. (1926, October 21). *The Gateway*, Vol. 17, No. 3, p. 6. Document Ar00602, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- The Maria Chapdelaine country today. (1926, December 16). *The Gateway*, Vol. 17, No. 11, pp. 1, 3. Document Ar00100, Document Ar00301, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Oke, W. (1928, January 12). Federation impressions. *The Gateway*, Vol. 18, No. 11, p. 3, Document Ar00300, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- French club cancels banquet. (1928a, January 19). *The Gateway*, Vol. 18, No. 12, p. 1. Document Ar00107, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- The N.F.C.U. S. conference. (1928b, January 19). *The Gateway*, Vol. 18, No. 12, p. 5. Document Ar00500, Document Ar00506, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le reunion he's mak gran' hooray. (1928, March 1). *The Gateway*, Vol. 18, No. 17, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Newton, R. (1928, October 5). Signal honour for Dean Howes. *The Gateway*, Vol. 19, No. 1, p. 1. Document Ar00105, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Wilson, A. (1929, January 10). Xmas N.F.C.U.S. conference dealt with interesting topics. *The Gateway*, Vol. 19, No. 11, pp. 1, 6. Document no. Ar00100, Document No. Ar00601, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le Francais parle au Canada [French spoken in Canada]. (1929, January 31). *The Gateway*, Vol. 19, No. 13, p. 6. Document Ar00607, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Chappel, N. (1929, February 21). A debater's wanderings or the tale of a talker. *The Gateway*, Vol. 19, No. 16, p. 6. Document Ar00600, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Chappel, N. (1929, February 28). A debater's wanderings or the tale of a talker. *The Gateway*, Vol. 19, No. 17, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Cameron, D. (1929, November 21). Report of imperial conference, Montreal, Sept. 6-16. *The Gateway*, Vol. 20, No. 7, p. 4. Document Ar00400, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

La Liberté:

La persécution dans Ontario [The persecution in Ontario]. (1913, June 3). *La Liberté*, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 1. Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

The Montreal Gazette:

Obituary: Howard Kennedy, noted author, dies. (1938, February 16). *The Montreal Gazette*, Vol. 167, No. 40, p. 9. Retrieved from:
<https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1946&dat=19380216&id=NYwxAAAAIBAJ&sjid=QagFAAAAIBA&pg=6586,1901213&hl=fr>

Le Patriote de l'Ouest:

Un exemple pour nos provinces [An example for our provinces]. (1918, June 26). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 8, No. 16, p. 1. Document Ar00101, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

La seule bonne entente [The only good understanding]. (1923a, March 21). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 3, p.1 Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Le rôle [sic] du journal. [The role of at the newspaper]. (1923b, March 21). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 3, p.1 Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

L'Université d'Ottawa ouvre une école de pédagogie [The University of Ottawa opens a school of pedagogy]. (1923c, March 21). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 4. Document Ar00402, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

La formation de nos instituteurs [Our teachers' education]. (1923, March 28). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 11, p. 1. Documents Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Les avantages économiques, religieux et nationaux des groupes franco-canadiens de l'Ouest [The economic, religious and national advantages of the Franco-Canadian groups in the West]. (1923, May 2). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 9, pp. 1-2. Documents Ar00100, Ar00200, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Québec et la colonisation de l'Ouest [Quebec and resettlement in the West]. (1923, May

- 9). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 10, p. 3. Document Ar00300, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le bétail canadien en France [Canadian cattle in France]. (1923, avril 11). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 6, p. 2. Document Ar00203, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le bétail canadien en Angleterre [Canadian cattle in England]. (1923a, avril 25). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 8, p. 1. Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- L'Ouest se plaint [The West complains]. (1923b, avril 25). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 8, p. 1. Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Encore les animaux canadiens en Angleterre [More about Canadian animals/cattle in England]. (1923, May 16). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 11, p. 4. Document Ar00401, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le Canada est en retard sur le Sud-Africain [Canada lags behind South Africa]. (1923a, July 11). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 19, p. 1. Document Ar00101, University of Alberta, Peel Prairie Provinces.
- L'inventeur du radio [The inventor of the radio]. (1923b, July 11). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 19, p. 7. Document Ar00701, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le cinéma peut servir à l'école [Cinema can be useful in school]. (1923, July 18). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 20, p. 2. Document Ar00204, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Les écoles bilingues de l'Ontario se consacrent à la Sainte-Vierge [Bilingual schools in Ontario are dedicated to the Holy Virgin]. (1923, August 22). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 25, p. 8, Document Ar00802, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- À la conférence impériale [At the Imperial Conference]. (1923, October 10). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 32, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Des manuscrits du Général Wolfe [Some manuscripts from General Wolfe]. (1923, October 24). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 13, No. 34, p. 5. Document Ar00504, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- À la conférence impériale [At the Imperial Conference]. (1923, October 10). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 16, No. 32, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie

Provinces, University of Alberta.

Au Christ-Roi d'abord! [To Christ the King first!]. (1926, October 20). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 16, No. 32, p. 1. Document Ar00100, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

À la conférence impériale [At the Imperial Conference]. (1926a, November 3). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 16, No. 34, p. 2. Document Ar00202, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Plus de familles anglaises pour le Canada [More English families for Canada]. (1926b, November 3). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 16, No. 34, p. 2. Document Ar00200, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Les Dominions et l'Angleterre sont égaux: Les Dominions sont des états autonomes [The Dominions and England are equal: The Dominions are autonomous states]. (1926, November 24). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 16, No. 37, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Du français au radio une fois par mois [French on the radio once a month]. (1927, February 2). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 16, No. 47, p. 8. Document Ar00800, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Le Klu-Klux-Klan, à nouveau, brûle une croix [The Klu Klux Klan burns yet another cross]. (1927, June 15). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 17, No. 14, p. 3. Document Ar00303, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Le radio reliera le Canada, l'Australie, l'Angleterre, l'Afrique et les Indes [Radio will link Canada, England, Africa and India]. (1927b, August 31). *Le Patriote de l'Ouest*, Vol. 17, No. 25, p. 3. Document Ar00305, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Press:

Imperial education conference opened in London. (1911, April 27). *Press*, Vol. 67, No. 14028, p. 7. Retrieved from:
<https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/CHP19110427.2.35?query=imperial%20education%20conference>

The Sunday Times:

Education the hope of empire: Dr. Viljoen and 1923 ideals. (1923, July 15).
The Sunday Times, Issue 5231, p. 15. The Sunday Times Digital Archive.

Retrieved from: <http://find.galegroup.com>.

Bishop of London's critics: Vigorous denial of 'meddling'. (1926, August 29). *The Sunday Times*, Issue 5394, p. 12. The Sunday Times Digital Archive.
Retrieved from: <http://find.galegroup.com>.

La Survivance:

Le nouveau projet de loi concernant l'éducation dans l'Alberta [New bill concerning education in Alberta]. (1928, November 29). *La Survivance*, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 4. Document Aroo400. Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

The Times Educational Supplement:

The imperial conference. (1923, June 30). *The Times Educational Supplement*, Vol. 13, No. 428, pp. 305, 311 [in the archival record book]. Retrieved from emails with Mary from TES Customer Service dated February 24th and 26th, 2016.

Bilingual problems. (1923, July 7). *The Times Educational Supplement*, Vol. 13, No. 429, pp. 317, 318 [in the archival record book]. Retrieved from emails with Mary from TES Customer Service dated February 24th and 26th, 2016.

Bilingual teaching. (1923, July 21). *The Times Educational Supplement*, Vol. 13, No. 431, p. 343 [in the archival record book]. Retrieved from emails with Mary from TES Customer Service dated February 24th and 26th, 2016.

The Times of London:

Teaching of Welsh. (1905, April 22). *The Times*, Issue 37688, p.10. Gale Document Number: CS1694066148, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from: <http://find.galegroup.com>.

House of Commons: The Irish language. (1906, May 29). *The Times*, Issue 38032, p. 10. Gale Document Number: CS100856509, The Times Digital Archive.
Retrieved from: <http://find.galegroup.com>

The South African constitution. (1909, May 29). *The Times*, Issue 38967, p. 10. Gale Document Number: CS721746104, The Times Digital Archive.
Retrieved from: <http://find.galegroup.com>

A bureau of education. (1911, April 25). *The Times*, Issue 39568, p. 4. Gale Document

- Number: CS67697817, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Unity in education: The Practical Side Of The Imperial Conference. (1911, May 17).
The Times, Issue 39587, p. 7. Gale Document Number: CS118684849,
The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- The language problem in Canada. (1912, February 6). *The Times*, Issue 39814, p. 5.
Gale Document Number: CS85261894. The Times Digital Archive,
Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- A reply to the French language congress. (1912, August 8). *The Times*,
Issue 39972, p. 5. Gale Document Number: CS85131016, The Times Digital
Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- The language question in Canada: An Anglo-French struggle (1913, January 17).
The Times, Issue 40111, p. 37. Gale Document Number: CS622788657,
The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Bonds of empire. (1923, June 26). *The Times*, Issue 43377, p. 9. Gale Document
Number: CS151196890, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Bilingual schools: Imperial education conference. (1923, July 4). *The Times*, Issue
43384, p. 16. Gale Document Number: CS269161700, The Times Digital
Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Education in the empire: Local and central control. (1923, July 5). *The Times*,
Issue 43385, p. 9. Gale Document Number: CS151852261, The Times Digital
Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- The cinema in education: Imperial conference decision. (1923, July 7). *The Times*,
Issue 43387, p.12. Gale Document Number: CS203101415, The Times Digital
Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference. (1923, July 9). *The Times*, Issue 43388, p. 13.
Gale Document Number: CS218567913, The Times Digital
Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>

- Education and the empire: An English renaissance. (1923, July 10). *The Times*, Issue 43389, p. 9. Gale Document Number: CS152376554, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Gray, H.B. (1923, July 17). Education in the empire: Public school boys overseas. *The Times*, Issue 43395, p. 8. Gale Document Number: CS134943985, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- The cinema in schools: Inquiry by teachers and film producers. (1923, October 26). *The Times*, Issue 43482, p. 14. Gale Document Number: CS236787034, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Prince of Wales to attend. (1927, May 24), *The Times*, Issue 44589, p. 18. Gale Document Number: CS30298080, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Education in the empire: A varied agenda. (1927, June 22). *The Times*, Issue 44614, p. 11. Gale Document Number: CS184753366, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: After-career of pupils. (1927, June 23). *The Times*, Issue 44615, p. 11. Gale Document Number: CS186719447, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Training for industry. (1927, June 24). *The Times*, Issue 44616, p. 13. Gale Document Number: CS218569944, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: The place of music. (1927, June 25). *The Times*, Issue 44617, p. 9. Gale Document Number: CS153820377, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Use of vernaculars. (1927, June 28). *The Times*, Issue 44619, p. 11. Gale Document Number: CS185015516, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>

- Imperial education conference: Teaching in tropical countries. (1927, June 29). *The Times*, Issue 44620, p. 10. Gale Document Number: CS168631517, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Needs in the tropics. (1927, June 30 1927). *The Times*, Issue 44621, p.21. Gale Document Number: CS269161700, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Examination and inspection. (1927, July 1). *The Times*, Issue 44622, p. 9. Gale Document Number: CS151985377, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Empire history and geography: Teaching of children in schools. (1927, July 2). *The Times*, Issues 44623, p. 9. Gale Document Number: CS151461090, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- The cinema in schools: Need of good films of empire. (1927, July 5). *The Times*, Issue 44625, p. 11. Gale Document Number: CS185408741, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Rural school in the dominions. (1927, July 6). *The Times*, Issue 44626, p. 21. Gale Document Number: CS353049830, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Lord Lovat on training of settlers. (1927, July 7). *The Times*, Issue 44627, p. 13. Gale Document Number: CS219618535, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- Imperial education conference: Report on interchange of teachers, (1927, July 8). *The Times*, Issue 44628, p. 9. Gale Document Number: CS151330024, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>
- The programmes: Empire broadcasting. (1927, July 13). *The Times*, Issue 44632, p. 26. Gale Document Number: CS437460205, The Times Digital Archive. Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>

Religion in Canada: Revival of old controversy. (1930, February 19). *The Times*, Issue 45441, p. 13. Gale Document Number: CS21809203, The Times Digital Archive Retrieved from:
<http://find.galegroup.com>

L'Union:

[J.A. MacNeil advertisement]. (1918, April 1). *L'Union*, Vol. 1, No. 9, p. 1. Document Ad00107_1, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Les Orangistes de Strathcona passent une résolution contre le français [The Strathcona Orange Lodge passes a resolution against the French language]. (1918, November 1). *L'Union*, Vol. 1, No. 23, p. 2. Document Ar00203, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Le bilinguisme [Bilingualism]. (1918, November 18). *L'Union*, Vol. 1, No. 24, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Riopel, L./Johnstone Walker. (1918, December 26). Pour la langue [In favour of the French language]. *L'Union*. Vol. 2, No. 7, p. 1. AN 5 A3 E2 U55, Microfilm, Bibliothèque Saint-Jean, University of Alberta.

Une chaire de français à l'Université de Cambridge [A modern language chair of French at Cambridge University]. (1919, June 5). *L'Union*. Vol. 2, No. 31, p. 4. Document Ar00402, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

[Immaculée-Conception Boarding School Advertisement]. (1919, September 25). *L'Union*, Vol. 2, No. 46, p. 2. AN 5 A3 E2 U55, Microfilm, Bibliothèque Saint-Jean, University of Alberta.

[Université de Montréal veterinarian school advertisement]. (1921, August 11). *L'Union*, Vol. 4, No. 40, p. 2. Document Ad00202_5, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

Le Consul de France à Edmonton [The French Consul in Edmonton]. (1921, August 18). *L'Union*, Vol. 4, No. 41, pp. 1, 8. Document Ar00102, Document Aroo809, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

L'école libre à Pembroke [An new French school in Pembroke]. (1923b, November 15). *L'Union*, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 2. Document Ar00201, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

L'Histoire des pionniers Canadiens-français de notre province [The history of French

- Canadian pioneers of our province]. (1927a, March 17). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 21, p. 1. Document Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Un incident au parlement [An incident in parliament]. (1927b, March 17). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 21, p. 1. Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le français au parlement [French in the parliament]. (1927, March 24). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 21, p. 1. Document Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le radio français de l'université [The university's French radio]. (1927c, April 7). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 24, p. 6. Document Ar00614, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Les cours de français de Ferguson [Ferguson's French courses]. (1927, May 26). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 31, p. 1. Document Ar00108, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Les Canadiens à l'honneur [Canadians are honoured]. (1927a, July 7). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 37, p. 1. Document Ar00103, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Monument au Père Lacombe [Monument to Father Lacombe]. (1927b, July 7). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 37, p. 1. Document Ar00105, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le congrès de l'A. C. F. A. [The A. C. F. A. convention] (1927, July 28). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 40, pp. 1, 8. Document Ar00118, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- [Le Collège des Jésuites Advertisement]. (1927, August 25). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 44, p. 8. Document Ad00804_2, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Henri Bourassa à Edmonton [Henri Bourassa in Edmonton]. (1927, September 22). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 48, p. 1. Document Ar00118, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Un déjeuner offert à l'Hon. J. P. Veniot Minsitre des postes [A breakfast is offered to the Hon. J. P. Veniot, Postmaster General]. (1927a, October 6). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 50, p. 1. Document Ar00112, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Henri Bourassa à Edmonton [Henri Bourassa in Edmonton]. (1927b, October 6). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 50, p. 1. Document Ar00118, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.

- Le règlement XVII est mis au rancart [Regulation XVII is repealed]. (1927c, October 6). *L'Union*, Vol. 10, No. 50, p. 8. [Reprinted from *La Liberté*]. Document Ar00815, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Henri Bourassa à Edmonton [Henri Bourassa in Edmonton]. (1927, October 13). *L'Union*, Vol. No. 10, No. 51, pp. 1, 6. Document Ar00106, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Le règlement 17 rayé officiellement [Regulation XVII officially stricken]. (1927, November 10). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 3, p. 9. Document Ar00906, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- M. le maire Bury [Mr. Mayor Bury]. (1927a, December 8). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 7, p. 1. Document Ar00107, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Herman Trelle (1927b, December 8). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 7, p. 1. Document Ar00107, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- L'Université d'Alberta et la langue française [The University of Alberta and the French language]. (1927c, December 8). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 7, p. 1. Document Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- La France les décore [France decorates them]. (1928, January 19). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 13, p. 1. Document Ar00105, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Un livre nouveau [A new book]. (1928, January 26). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 14, p. 1. Document Ar00104, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Un livre nouveau que tous devraient posséder [A new book that everyone should have] [Book Advertisement]. 1928, February 9). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 16, p. 2. Document Ad00202_12, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Banquet en l'honneur des Révérends Pères Bellavance et D'Orsonnens [Banquet in honor of Reverend Fathers Bellavance and D'Orsonnens]. (1928, May 10). *L'Union*, Vol. 11, No. 29, p. 2. Document Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.
- Une garantie pour nos écoles: Entrevue avec le Premier Ministre M. Brownlee, et M. Perren Baker, Ministre de l'Éducation [A guarantee for our schools: Interview with Premier Brownlee and Mr. Perren Baker, Minister of Education]. (1929, January 10) *L'Union*, Vol. 12, No. 12, p. 1. Document Item Ar00102, Peel's Prairie Provinces, University of Alberta.